DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 493 TE 001 491

By-Pennington, Donald R.

A Nation-Wide Survey of the Supervision of English Student Teaching in Colleges and Universities. Interim Report.

Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary English Teachers (ISCPET), Urbana.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-5-0789
Pub Date 6 Jun 69
Contract-OEC-5-10-029
Note-67p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.45
Descriptors-*College Supervisors, *Cooperating Teachers, *English Instruction, Practicum Supervision, Preservice Education, *Student Teaching, Teacher Attitudes, *Teacher Education, Teacher Educators, Teacher Supervision, Teaching Conditions, Teaching Load
Identifiers-Project English

To survey current secondary school practices in the supervision of student teachers of English, ISCPET sent out questionnaires on this and other aspects of the student teaching program to 837 U. S. colleges and universities that prepare English teachers. Four aspects of English student teaching programs were emphasized in the survey--arrangements and facilities for student teaching, selection and duties of cooperating teachers, responsibilities of college supervisors, and attitudes of college and secondary school personnel toward the supervision program. Respondents were also asked to indicate what they believed to be the "ideal" practice. After the data from 465 respondents were received, tabulated, and analyzed, those areas in which current practices deviated statistically from ideal practices were determined, and recommendations for the improvement of supervisory programs of student teaching in English were made. (Tables indicating the qualities and conditions of present student teaching supervision practices and other aspects of the student teaching program are included.) (Author/JB)

ED031493

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTERIM REPORT

USOE Project Number HE-145
USOE Contract Number OE-5-10-029
ISCPET Subcontract Number SS-5-7-68

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER
IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL
ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

A Nation-Wide Survey of the Supervision of English Student Teaching in Colleges and Universities

Donald R. Pennington
Greenville College
Greenville, Illinois

June 6, 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and to a subcontract with the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Contractors and subcontractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the projects. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TE001491

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

Director: J. N. Hook
Associate Director: Paul H. Jacobs
Research Associate: Raymond D. Crisp

Project Headquarters:
1210 West California
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Raymond D. Crisp, University of Illinois (non-voting member)
William H. Evans, Southern Illinois University, past member
John S. Gerrietts, Loyola University, past member and Chairman
John M. Heissler, Illinois State University, past Chairman
J. N. Hook, University of Illinois
Paul H. Jacobs, University of Illinois
Alfred L. Papillon, DePaul University, Chairman
Justus R. Pearson, Illinois Wesleyan University, past member and Chairman
Roy K. Weshinskey, Southern Illinois University, past Chairman

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS AND PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Aurora College - Roy L. Crews and Ethel W. Tapper
Bradley University - W. F. Elwood and Paul Sawyer
DePaul University - Margaret M. Neville and Alfred L. Papillon
Greenville College - I. D. Baker and Donald R. Pennington
Illinois Institute of Technology - A. L. Davis and Henry C. Knepler
Illinois State University - Victor E. Gimmestad and John M. Heissler
Illinois Wesleyan University - Justus R. Pearson and Clifford Pfeltz
Knox College - Michael G. Crowell and Carl Eisemann
Loyola University - James Barry and Sister Mary Constantine
Monmouth College - Grace Boswell and Ben T. Shawver
North Central College - Richard M. Eastman and Erling Peterson
Northwestern University - Sidney Bergquist and Wallace Douglas
Olivet Nazarene College - Fordyce Bennett and Vernon T. Groves
Rockford College - William D. Baker and Ronald Podeschi
Roosevelt University - William Leppert and William Makely
Saint Xavier College - Thomas Deegan and George K. McGuire
Southern Illinois University - Ellen A. Frogner and Roy K. Weshinskey
University of Chicago - Janet A. Emig and Robert Parker
University of Illinois - J. N. Hook and Paul H. Jacobs
Western Illinois University - Alfred Lindsey, Jr. and Sherman Rush

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Harry S. Broudy, University of Illinois
Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University
Robert Bush, Stanford University
Nelson W. Francis, Brown University
Nathaniel Gage, Stanford University
Alfred H. Grommon, Stanford University
William Riley Parker, Indiana University (Deceased)
Robert C. Pooley, Department of Public Instruction, Wisconsin
Loren Reid, University of Missouri
William Sheldon, Syracuse University
James R. Squire, formerly of the University of Illinois; past Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to express my gratitude to several people on the campus of Greenville College for their assistance in this study. Dr. I. D. Baker, Chairman of the Education Department, has provided encouragement, ideas, and editorial assistance during the course of the study. Miss Carol Messer, Mrs. Eleanor Pennington, and Miss Mari Nelson have done much of the tabulating and typing.

I am also indebted to the Executive Committee and the Headquarters Staff of ISCPET for valuable assistance in planning the questionnaire and the final report. Special appreciation is extended to Dr. Alfred L. Papillon of DePaul University for his assistance in helping decide upon appropriate statistical tests.

I should also like to express my appreciation to the persons who responded to the questionnaire items, providing the basic information presented in this report.

D.R.P.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES. vi

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY 1

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION 2

The Questionnaire. 2
Analyses of the Data 3
Distribution of Responses. 5

RESULTS OF THE STUDY. 8

The Typical Program 8
Strengths of English Education Programs. 9
Student Teaching Programs. 13

Arrangements for Student Teaching. 13
Time Spent in Student Teaching 15
Success and Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience. 20
Student Teaching and Methods Courses 25

Cooperating Teachers 26
Characteristics of Cooperating Teachers. 26
Training and Benefits. 29

College Supervisors. 34
Qualifications 34
Credit for Supervision 37
Activities of Supervision. 40

Attitudes Toward Supervision 46

CONCLUSIONS 56

RECOMMENDATIONS 57

For Improvements in Programs 57
Suggestions for Future Research 59

SUMMARY 60

LIST OF TABLES

1. Number of Students Enrolled in Prospective Secondary School English Teacher Programs 6

2. Departmental Affiliation of Respondents to Questionnaire 7

3. Frequency Count of Factors of Success in English Teacher Preparation Programs 10

4. Term Used by Colleges and Universities to Describe the Student Teacher. 14

5. The Point in the Academic Career at Which Student Teaching Occurs 14

6. Department Listing of the Courses in Student Teaching. 15

7. Types of Schools Used in Providing Student Teaching Experience 15

8. Average Number of Hours of Actual Teaching Done by Each Student Teacher in English 16

9. Number of Hours of Academic Credit Received for Student Teaching 17

10. Occasion When Student Teacher First Meets Cooperating Teacher. 18

11. Length of Student Teaching Period. 19

12. Major Influences Upon the Success of Student Teacher in English 21

13. Observable Behavior of Student Teachers Considered Most Significant by Respondents 22

14. Kinds of Evaluation Devices of Student Teachers. 23

15. Person(s) Who Determine Final Evaluative Grade of Student Teacher. 24

16. Types of Methods Courses for Student Teachers in English 25

17. Sequential Relationship of Student Teaching to Methods Courses. 25

18. Term Used to Describe the Secondary School English Teacher with Whom the Student Teacher Works. 27

19. Selectors of Cooperating Teachers. 27

20. Basic Qualifications of Cooperating Teachers 28

21. Qualities of Cooperating Teachers Considered Most Significant 29

22. Items of Training Given English Cooperating Teachers by the College. 31

23. Benefits Awarded to Cooperating Teachers Besides Money. 32

24. Honoraria Paid School Systems and/or Cooperating Teachers for Working with a Student Teacher. 33

25. Professional Status of Supervisors of Student Teachers in English. 35

26. Respondents' Attitudes Toward Importance of Supervisors' Having Had Experience in Teaching Secondary School English. 35

27. Qualifications of Supervisors of English Student Teachers Considered Most Significant .36

28. Relationship of College Supervisors to Methods Courses. 37

29. Number of Student Teachers Usually Assigned to Each Supervisor. 38

30. Faculty Teaching Load Credit for Supervising Student Teachers. 39

31. Number of Seminar Sessions Normally Held During Student Teaching Period 41

32. Farthest Distance (One-Way) English Supervisor Travels to Visit Student Teachers 42

33. Number of Visits Each Supervisor Normally Makes to Student Teacher's School. 42

34. Total Number of Hours the English Supervisor Spends Observing Each Student Teacher in Actual Teaching 43

35. Number of Consultations of Supervisor with Each Student Teacher 43

36. Average Total Hours that Supervisor Spends Conferring with Each English Student Teacher 44

37. Location of the Supervisor's Consultations with Student Teachers. 44

38. Usual Number of Consultations of Supervisor with Cooperating Teacher 45

39. Additional Persons Present When Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher Confer. 45

40. General Attitude of Student Teachers Toward Role, Function, Status of College Supervisor of English Student Teachers. 52

41. General Attitude of College Supervisor of English Student Teachers Toward His Role, Functions, Status 53

42. General Attitude of Cooperating Teachers Toward Role, Function, Status of College Supervisor of English Student Teachers 53

43. General Attitude of Secondary School Administrations Toward Role, Function, Status of College Supervisors of English Student Teachers. 54

44. General Attitude of Education Department Toward Role, Functions, Status of College Supervisors of English Student Teachers 54

45. General Attitude of College Administration Toward Role, Functions, Status of College Supervisor of English Student Teacher. 55

46. General Attitude of English Department Toward Role, Functions, Status of College Supervisor of English Student Teachers. 55

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Most persons associated with teacher preparation programs are aware that usually the last task a faculty member wants to take on and the first he wants to relinquish is the actual classroom supervision of student teachers. Robert T. Pfeiffer,[1] writing in the 1964 Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, has suggested that the concerns responsible for the rather low status of the college supervision of student teachers generally include a lack of role definition, heavy supervision loads, travel and logistic difficulties, lack of status among colleagues, and strained relationships with the student teachers. That the supervision is often done by graduate assistants (sometimes with little teaching experience themselves) or by retired public school teachers and administrators has contributed much to the low status of the job.

Other educational leaders have expressed concern over the status and lack of serious attention paid to the improvement of student teaching supervision programs in educational institutions. A 1966 National TEPS commission discussion paper entitled "Who's in Charge Here?"[2] succinctly suggests, among other recommendations, an increased involvement of the nation's teacher training institutions in supervising their student teachers. Among the TEPS concerns are these: the nature and amount of supervision and assistance provided by the college or university to the student teacher and to the cooperating teacher; the professional qualifications of the supervising teacher; the quality of the educational system in which student teaching is to be done; the administrative arrangements through which colleges and universities place students in the school. Dr. James R. Squire,[3] former Executive Secretary of the National Council of Teachers of English, in an address before specialists in English education at the Conference on English Education meeting in 1966, expressed his concern over the lack of attention that institutions training prospective English teachers generally give the supervision of the student teaching experiences of their candidates. He recommended that the persons responsible for the English teacher training programs should not only be more concerned with this aspect of their total programs but also should do more actual supervising in the classrooms. These two expressions of interest--one concerned with teacher preparation in general, the other with English teacher preparation specifically--are indicative of a growing interest in an aspect of preparation in professional education that often has been given scant attention and little careful scrutiny.

---

[1] Robert T. Pfiefer. "Common Concerns of College Supervisors" (pp. 11-20) in The College Supervisor: Conflict and Challenge, 43rd Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. (Cedar Falls, Iowa): Association for Student Teaching, 1964.

[2] National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Who's in Charge Here? Fixing Responsibility for Student Teaching, A Discussion Paper. (Washington, D.C.): National Education Association, 1966.

[3] James R. Squire. "The Impact of New Programs on Education of Teachers of English," (pp. 7-14) in New Trends in English ed. by David Stryker.(Champaign, Illinois): National Council of Teachers of English, 1966.

This Special Research Study undertaken for the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers has attempted to provide attention and scrutiny to both current practices relating to the supervision of secondary school English student teachers and suggestions for improvements.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

The Questionnaire

The procedure involved in this project has been to tabulate responses to items on a questionnaire which was distributed to persons responsible for or somehow closely associated with the supervision of student teachers of English in American secondary schools.

In order to obtain names of appropriate persons to whom the questionnaires should be sent, a letter was sent to 1,175 colleges and universities on a list compiled by consulting three 1966 directories to discover those schools which were listed as having graduated English majors during the preceding year. The list was cross-checked against the group of institutions represented by persons with membership in the Conference on English Education.

In the fall of 1966 a letter, addressed either to the Director of Student Teaching or to a Conference on English Education member at the school, told of the nature of the study and of the proposed questionnaire. Enclosed was a sheet on which the respondent was asked to indicate whether or not that institution had a program for the preparation of prospective secondary school English teachers and to indicate the name and address of the person to whom the questionnaire should be sent. Responses to this first mailing numbered 837 (72.1 percent of mailing), of which 807 indicated that they do prepare English teachers for secondary schools. Added to this list of 807 institutions was another group of 20 institutions that had not responded to the first letter of inquiry but which were known to have English teacher preparation programs. Mailing of these 827 questionnaires was completed in April, 1967. By the first of June, more than 400 completed or partially completed questionnaires had been returned. A follow-up letter early in September told the persons who had not returned the questionnaires that we were still eager to have them completed and returned. Within six weeks, another sixty questionnaires were returned, the last one reaching the office on October 30, 1967. The number of questionnaires usable for tabulating responses was 465 (56.2 percent of mailing). Another ten questionnaires were returned with explanations such as these:

> Information from us would be of little value to you. We average one-half English student teacher a year.
>
> There's no one at our school who is interested in filling this out.

> I have no time to fill out questionnaires.
>
> [We're] too small and personal a place to be of much value to you. Only two or three faculty members are interested in teacher education.
>
> Questionnaires like this are for little minds.

The questionnaire asked about, among other things, the terms used in describing the program, the logistical arrangements involved in actual supervision, the selection of and requirements for cooperating teachers and student teaching placements, and the attitudes toward the role of the college supervisor. The respondents were also often asked to indicate the ideal arrangement.

Analyses of the Data

A total of 465 sets of responses was tabulated, but for no item were data derived from every one of the questionnaires. The percentages listed each item category, therefore, are computed on the total number of responses for that specific item, not on the total number of completed or partially completed questionnaires received. Similarly, the percentages listed in the columns designating institution size are based upon the number of responses to that particular item, not upon the total number of returned questionnaires from institutions in that classification. The columns of percentages in the tables sometimes do not add up to exactly 100 because of rounding error.

Responses to several of the items total more than 465, an indication that more than one response was indicated as appropriate for the programs of some of the institutions. An example is the item which asks at what point student teaching occurs in the academic career. Most respondents marked only one of the possible responses; a few indicated, however, that two of the arrangements are used in their schools. Percentages in these tables are based upon total number of responses rather than upon the total number of colleges and universities represented in the responses.

In questions asking for suggestions about ideal arrangements, the responses have been incorporated into one figure rather than by institutional size on the assumption that the size of the program in which the respondent works would not be particularly relevant in determining the attitude toward ideal arrangements. This assumption has not been tested in this specific study. A review of the raw data from the questionnaires could, of course, provide material for such a study.

A chi-square test has been applied to determine whether or not differences between practices and suggested ideal arrangements are statistically significant. In the tables, the symbol (=) beside the chi-square total indicates that the difference between ideals and practices is statistically significant at the .001 level. Although not computed for this particular report, a chi-square test could also be applied to test the level of statistical significance according to institutional size classifications. The test has not been applied in situations in which five or fewer responses have been given to a particular ideal arrangement. Asking for the ideal was felt to be inappropriate for several of the questionnaire items; this column, therefore, does not appear in all of the tables.

An additional statistical test has been applied to indicate the difference between the practice and the ideal. An index number has been computed by dividing the percentage of the practice by the percentage of the ideal. In general, an index number of more than 1.00 is an indication that the practice is at least moderately widespread but not generally considered ideal. An index of less than 1.00 is an indication that the practice is not widespread but one which a relatively large proportion of respondents consider ideal. In order to obtain an indication of a higher level of significance than the general direction of trend, arbitrary index numbers have been chosen. A level of 1.50 or more is considered substantive enough to be interpreted as a practice that shows evidence of becoming out-dated. An index number of 0.50 or less is considered substantive enough to be considered an ideal that shows a marked break from current practice. Some practices which very well may be on the way to obsolescence or to a promising future have not been given an index number because the percentages of the practice and the ideal do not total an adequate amount. Generally in these tables an index number has been computed only when the sum of the two percentages equals at least 30. This number is much less critical than that which statisticians usually use in determining significance in index numbers. To be considered substantive, an index number usually requires a sum of at least 66.66 percent for index numbers more than 1.00, a sum of 33.33 percent for index numbers less than 1.00. Readers of this report should remember that only those index numbers above 1.50 and below 0.50, and which meet the total percentage requirement, should be considered statistically significant in indicating a trend. These numbers are indicated in the tables with the numeral sign: (#).

A basic difference in the use of the chi-square test and the index number test in this study is that chi-square is applied to a comparison of the total set of current practices and the total set of ideal practices indicated in a table; the index number test is applied to a comparison of the currency and ideal of a specific practice. Statistical significance, according to the chi-square test, indicates that the total set of current practices on a given question differs from the set of ideal practices. Significance, according to the index number test, indicates that a specific practice among various alternatives differs from its considered ideal use.

In the items that involve the listing of influences, factors of success, significant qualifications, and observable behavior, the traits have been awarded points according to the ranking given them. Apparent overlapping of some of the items is due primarily to write-in suggestions which differ slightly from the terms already suggested in the questionnaire.

In many items of the questionnaire, space was provided for the respondents to insert practices other than those suggested. In several, a written-in frequency appeared often enough to be included in the table. These written-in practices have been marked with a double asterisk: (**).

In the tables without multiple responses, a tabulation is included of the number of respondents who neglected to respond to the item. One might speculate as to why some items were not responded to as well as were others. Ambiguity of the question, excessive time needed to think through or find the appropriate response, dislike of the question, embarrassment at acknowledging the institution's practice--these are a few of the several possible reasons. We have not attempted to speculate beyond this, but have indicated the numbers so that the reader may do so if he wishes.

At the risk of ambiguity but for the sake of variety, these terms have been used interchangeably in this report: colleges and universities, institutions, schools. The term "respondents" is used regularly to refer to the persons who completed and returned the questionnaire.

The information gained from the responses to the questionnaire can be classified into these areas: arrangements for student teaching in secondary schools, selection and qualifications of cooperating teachers, supervision programs of colleges and universities, and attitudes toward the tasks of the supervisor. Since the tables are generally self-explanatory, a brief general discussion of groups of tables is usually included rather than a separate discussion of each table.

SYMBOLS USED IN THE TABLES

*	other responses too few to classify in table
**	response not included in original questionnaire
X^2	chi-square
=	statistically significant at .001 level according to X^2 test
#	statistically significant index number, more than 1.5 or less than 0.50

Distribution of Responses

The list of 465 institutions whose programs are included in the survey includes a variety of institutional sizes and geographic areas. Data for the study have been received from colleges and universities in 47 states. The states with the larger numbers of institutions represented in the survey include Illinois, 29; Texas and California, 24 each; Pennsylvania, 22; and New York, 21.

The number of English teacher preparation graduates varies widely in the 465 schools. Some institutions represented by the responses to the questionnaire average only two or three such students while others produce more than 160 secondary school English teacher candidates each year. In order to examine possible differences in practices according to the size of the institution's English teacher preparation program, the data have been grouped into four categories based on the average number of secondary school English teachers prepared annually. The number of schools included in each category is indicated below in Table 1.

TABLE 1: NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN PROSPECTIVE SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHER PROGRAMS

Number of Students Enrolled in Prospective Secondary School English Teacher Programs	Number of Institutions Represented by Questionnaire Response
0 - 4	49
5 - 9	100
0 - 9	149
10 - 19	119
20 - 29	49
20 - 29	168
30 - 39	44
40 - 49	28
30 - 49	72
50 - 59	18
60 - 69	9
70 - 99	27
100 or more	22
50 or more	76
TOTAL	465

No attempt has been made to correlate responses with the departmental affiliations of the persons who filled out the questionnaires. These departmental affiliations of the respondents have been counted, however, and are listed in Table 2.

TABLE 2: DEPARTMENTAL AFFILIATION OF RESPONDENTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%		
Education	84	58.3	81	50.3	32	44.4	39	52.0	236	52.2
Psychology-education	9	6.3	1	0.6	1	1.4	0	0.0	11	2.4
Director of student teaching	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	6.9	5	6.7	10	2.2
Psychology	0	0.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
Social psychology and education	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
Behavioral science	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
M.A.T. program	0	0.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
Total	95	66.0	84	52.2	38	52.8	44	58.6	261	57.7
English	41	28.5	64	39.8	32	44.4	15	20.0	152	33.6
English - speech	1	0.7	1	0.6	1	1.4	3	4.0	6	1.3
English and languages	0	0.0	2	1.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.4
Language and literature	0	0.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	1.3	2	0.4
Humanities	0	0.0	4	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.4
Philosophy	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
Total	43	29.9	72	44.7	33	45.8	19	25.3	167	36.9
English-education	5	3.5	5	3.1	1	1.4	10	13.3	21	4.6
Educational psychology and English	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.2
English and secondary education	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.7	2	0.4
Total	6	4.2	5	3.1	1	1.4	12	16.0	24	5.3
N =	144		161		72		75		452	
Total %		100.1		99.9		99.9		100.0		99.6
No indication as to affiliation	5		7		0		1		13	

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The Typical Program

According to the data compiled from the questionnaires, the typical program in the supervision of student teachers of secondary school English is that described below. The typical program is based on statistical modes.

On a campus containing about 1,600 students, between 10 and 19 neophyte teachers of secondary school English complete student teaching annually. In this typical program, the student teacher at some point during his senior year is enrolled in a course listed in the education department and spends half the semester for the entire school day at a public junior or senior high school within forty miles of the college campus completing student teaching. He receives six semester hours of academic credit for the course. During the half semester the student teacher spends in the school, he completes between ninety and one hundred twenty clock hours of actual teaching. The student teacher will already have completed the course in special methods of teaching English in addition to the course in general teaching methods.

The extent of success of the typical student teacher in the typical college or university depends largely upon the person's basic personality traits rather than upon skills and knowledge acquired within the institution's teacher preparation program. The student's general mental ability also seems to be an important factor in the matter of success in student teaching. The helpfulness and advice given by the cooperating teacher is a third important factor in the success of the student teacher. Less important but still of significance is the actual teaching skill of the cooperating teacher. Also important factors in determining the success of the English student teacher is the background which he obtains from courses in the institution's program: special secondary school English teaching methods and literature and language courses. Considered somewhat less important contributing factors to his teaching success are the student teacher's background from educational psychology and composition courses, his prior experience with young people, and the amount of supervision given by the college supervisor.

The task of evaluating the work of the student teacher typically is shared by the cooperating teacher and the supervisor with the final semester letter grade evaluation determined by the supervisor but with much advice from the cooperating teacher. Both the supervisor and the cooperating teacher also provide written evaluations and completed checklists concerning the work of each student teacher. About thirty percent of the student teachers of English are awarded the grade of A, sixty percent receive the grade of B, and most of the remaining ten percent receive C with only a rare D or F being given. The evaluation is arrived at largely through observation of the teacher's ability to create an atmosphere for learning; his apparent knowledge of content material being used in the English classes he teaches, his imagination and resourcefulness in presenting material, and his ability to elicit the interest of the students. Other significant, but somewhat less important, areas of observable behavior on the part of the student teacher are his skill in eliciting student response, his ability to control the behavior of students in the classroom, his attention to individual differences among his students, and his apparent self-confidence while teaching.

The selection of the experienced English teachers who serve as cooperating teachers is made by the principal of the secondary school and the director of student teaching of the college, usually in consultation with each other. Basic qualifications of those teachers selected are these: a recommendation from the principal; at least two years of teaching experience, one within the school system; and an undergraduate major in English. Considered by the college personnel as the most important qualities found in the especially able cooperating teachers are these: his skill in teaching, his ability to work with novice teachers, and his dedication to the training of prospective English teachers.

The college provides the cooperating teacher a handbook and a dinner meeting or workshop in order to acquaint him with the college's program. The college awards the cooperating teacher $50 for each student teacher with whom he works. Fringe benefits include exemption from paying tuition for graduate (and undergraduate) work at the institution and complimentary tickets for college athletic and cultural events.

The supervisor of English student teachers typically is a professor in the education department. He almost certainly has had experience teaching in secondary schools, but not necessarily has he had experience teaching English. Experience in teaching high school English, however, is considered by college and university personnel to be a basic qualification of the supervisor. Also highly significant as qualifications of the good supervisor are his dedication to the training of prospective English teachers, his knowledge of effective ways to teach English, his understanding of the learning process; and his knowledge of content, materials, and organization of English programs in secondary schools.

The supervisor typically receives teaching load credit of one hour for the supervision of two student teachers, and usually has at least thirteen to supervise each term. He usually visits each student three or four times during the student teaching session and sees the student actually teaching a total of four or five hours. He meets with the student teacher after each visit, usually at the secondary school. He also usually confers with the cooperating teacher during each visit. He meets with a group of English student teachers in a seminar at least five times during the student teaching session.

Despite the negative attitude often expressed toward the supervisor's work, in general the public schools are favorable toward the role and function of the supervisor. Especially favorable are the supervisors themselves, and the secondary school administrators generally approve of the work of the supervisors. Only slightly less favorable is the general attitude of the college education department toward the function of the supervisor. The attitudes of the college English department and the college administration toward the importance of the supervisor's task are somewhat less high than those of the other groups but are still generally favorable.

Strengths of English Education Programs

An open-ended item on the questionnaire asked the respondents to indicate the strengths of their institutions' English education programs. In Table 3, the many factors mentioned have been classified and listed according to their frequency of mention. Most respondents listed more than one factor and many wrote comments that were difficult to translate into meaningful classifications. The categories were arrived at somewhat arbitrarily and they reflect some overlapping. The table does not contain tabulation of the number of schools which use these procedures. Rather it contains a list of those elements named as chiefly responsible for success in various English education programs.

The question asked for the factors of success of the total English teacher preparation program, not just those factors relevant to supervision. With this in mind, one should note the frequent mention of supervision-related factors.

TABLE 3: FREQUENCY COUNT OF FACTORS OF SUCCESS IN ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

	Number of respondents mentioning factor
General academic program of college or university	62
Quality of supervisors of student teachers	50
Quality of methods course(s)	48
Individual counseling of students in program	36
Professional attitudes instilled in students	33
Careful screening of candidates to program	32
Quality of cooperating teachers	31
Quality of English teacher training students	26
Careful placement of student teachers in schools	26
Close cooperation between college and secondary school	26
Large amount of time spent in student teaching	25
Type of help given by college supervisor	23
Supervisor's rapport with student teacher	20
Involvement of total college in teacher education	19
Small numbers of student teachers	17
Professional semester	14
Seminars held during student teaching period	12
Pre-student teaching activities (video tapes, micro-teaching, field trips, workshops, individual research)	12
Methods class and student teaching at same time	10
Enthusiasm about secondary school teaching instilled in students	10
Availability of supervisors when student teachers wish to confer	9
Practical approach in methods course, student teaching	8
Teaching experience before student teaching	7
An emphasis on content courses	7

Among other factors of successful programs mentioned by at least three respondents are these:

teacher of methods course has high school teaching experience
director of student teaching has high school teaching experience
use of regular faculty members as supervisors
supervision done by two persons representing both English and education
supervisor same person as methods instructor
summer workshop for supervisors and cooperating teachers
follow-up program after student teaching
methods class after student teaching
internship program
student teaching centers
emphasis on new teaching methods and linguistics
pass-fail evaluation rather than letter grades
light faculty loads
rapport between English and education departments
good English department
good education department
religious emphasis in college

Following is a sampling of the respondents' comments from which the tabulations for Table 3 were gained:

> We give the students a broad overview of the school. We observe as frequently as possible, at least seven to ten times. Follow-up for two years after graduation. Expect complete and workable lesson plans. Positive in critical evaluation. Offer commendation occasionally. Encourage professionalism and academic growth...We let the student know we are his friend and are always available to assist him.
>
> Involvement of English professors in visiting the secondary schools to supervise student teachers. There is mutual benefit--to the student teachers in receiving criticism and help, and to the college personnel in receiving valuable feedback.
>
> The employment of excellent people in the school of education for the supervision of student teachers. Although not a specialist in English, the typical one of this group knows good English teaching, and is skilled in helping young teachers to assess and change their approaches. These men are able and willing to ask 'unaskable' questions about current English teaching which we feel are not always raised by those in the field of English.
>
> We are fortunate here. The supervisors care about students as persons, about English as a subject, and about teaching itself.

We ask only secondary [school] teachers who are really interested in the program to accept student teachers.

I think the close cooperation of the English and education departments gives the students a feeling of security and a realization that both content and method are essential. Careful placement of students with cooperating teachers suited to their personalities has forestalled possible tensions. Since the group is usually small, personal contact is given freely.

Observation is arranged in the English methods course so that the prospective English teacher can observe his assignment before he teaches in it...Supervision is done by members of the English department...Counseling of prospective English teachers is provided from the beginning of the junior year through the end of the fifth year by the supervisory staff of the English department.

Only the good shall enter...Only the best should leave.

Involvement of supervising teachers and student teachers in seminars where problems arising in student teaching are bared, discussed, and solutions are sought.

These emphases: All-day student teaching experience, gradual assumption of classroom duties by student teachers, close supervision of student teachers, interest in success of student teachers, selection of public school supervising teacher, matching of personalities if possible, student teaching block.

A variety of classroom situations (city accelerated class, small town heterogeneous class, rural disadvantaged class, etc.)

I came to teach methods after 15 years of high school teaching. For the first year, anyway, I think that what I had to offer the new teachers was relevant.

We emphasize the subject matter; teaching is secondary.

Arranging student teacher programs which meet individual needs... taking advantage of the results of research findings and of new technical developments.

College supervision is so frequent that any problems are quickly eliminated.

The emphasis is upon teaching as an art rather than as a science, upon content rather than method.

Our greatest success has probably been the creation of a type of atmosphere in which the student feels at ease to visit at any time his teachers or to suggest weaknesses in the program.

> Two supervisors per student, required conferences, professional responsibility placed on the student, cooperation of critic teachers, professional spirit of department.
>
> I feel that the student teaching experience is simply the culmination of three and one-half semesters of preparation in the academic field in which the student expects to teach. No student is permitted to teach unless he is declared qualified by both the English and the education departments. Once this is determined, the concentration in the final semester of the educational psychology, adolescent psychology and methods together with student teaching is a great help...The ultimate success of the student teaching experience depends greatly on the skill of the cooperating teacher, the relevance of the methods course, the attitude of the college supervisors. We pride ourselves in working for the best in each area.

Several respondents indicated only qualified success in their English education programs with comments such as these:

> We are available at home at all hours (I have had phone calls at 12 a.m. from student teachers) for problems. The 15 seminars have much group therapy for students...But perfection is still far away.
>
> I really am not convinced it is successful. Success is directly related to the local clinical situation and the quality of the cooperating teacher.

A few responded with a denial of success:

> Our English education program is not successful.
>
> Perhaps we could do a better job if the English and education departments didn't fight over the students.

Despite an occasional listing of this and other problems, most of the 289 respondents who wrote comments indicated that they felt their institution's program to be at least moderately successful.

Student Teaching Programs

Arrangements for Student Teaching

Although the term "student teacher" and "practice teacher" are used interchangeably by many persons, the official term in a preponderance of educational institutions is the former. As the term "intern" often refers to a specific type of graduate program different from an institution's undergraduate program, some schools use both "intern" and another term. Similarly, some schools have indicated that student teaching may occur in either the senior year or the graduate program.

There is statistical evidence to suggest that the respondents to the questionnaire prefer that student teaching occur within the graduate program rather than during the senior year of the undergraduate program, by far the common current practice in American colleges and universities. Student teaching during the junior year has little current practice and only slightly more strength as an "ideal" arrangement.

Student teaching in almost nine out of ten colleges is listed as a course in the education department, which presumably usually has complete jurisdiction over and responsibility for the course. There is strong statistical evidence that ideally the listing and operation of the course in student teaching should become the joint responsibility of English and education departments.

Public senior high and junior high schools are the types of schools used most frequently for student teaching placements in English. Senior high schools of all types (public, private, laboratory) are used somewhat more frequently than junior high schools. Student teaching placements at the junior college and college level are rare.

TABLE 4: TERM USED BY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES TO DESCRIBE THE STUDENT TEACHER

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%		
Student Teacher	133	91.1	152	90.5	62	91.2	69	90.8	416	90.82
Practice Teacher	10	6.8	7	4.1	4	5.9	4	5.3	25	5.45
Intern	2	1.4	2	1.2	2	2.9	2	2.6	8	1.74
Cadet Teacher **	0	0.0	4	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.87
Others*	1	0.7	3	1.8	0	0.0	1	1.3	5	1.09
N =	146		168		68		76		458	
Total %		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		99.97
No response	3		0		4		0		7	

*Others include apprentice teacher, associate teacher, graduate assistant, student instructor

TABLE 5: THE POINT IN THE ACADEMIC CAREER AT WHICH STUDENT TEACHING OCCURS

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
The senior year	135	91.2	141	84.4	64	80.0	70	82.4	410	85.41	227	66.96	13.69	1.28
The graduate program	10	6.8	21	12.5	13	16.3	11	12.9	55	11.45	90	26.54	66.69	.43#
The junior year	3	2.0	5	3.0	3	3.8	4	4.7	15	3.12	17	5.01	3.27	-
Others*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	1.47	-	-
N(multiple responses) =	148		167		80		85		480		339		83.65=	
Total %		100.0		99.9		100.1		100.0		99.98		99.98		

*Other ideals include an extra semester, either junior or senior year, senior year and internship, distributed over years 2, 3, and 4.

TABLE 6: DEPARTMENT LISTING OF THE COURSE IN STUDENT TEACHING

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students							
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
An education course	120	87.6	135	87.1	57	89.1	62	93.9	374	88.21	194	54.64	46.48	1.62#
An English course	6	4.4	8	5.2	2	3.1	3	4.6	19	4.48	48	13.52	64.00	-
A joint offering	11	8.0	12	7.7	5	7.8	1	1.5	29	6.84	113	31.83	330.04	.22#
N =	139		155		64		66		424		355		440.52=	
Total %		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		99.53		99.99		
No response	10		13		8		10		41					

TABLE 7: TYPES OF SCHOOLS USED IN PROVIDING STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students			
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Total	%
Public senior high	131	41.3	100	41.7	66	44.3	68	37.8	365	40.73
Public junior high	125	39.4	96	40.0	63	42.3	66	34.7	350	39.06
Private senior high	38	12.0	20	8.3	4	2.7	16	8.4	78	8.70
Private junior high	12	3.8	8	3.3	4	2.7	6	3.1	30	3.34
Laboratory senior high	4	1.3	5	2.1	4	2.7	17	8.9	30	3.34
Laboratory junior high	3	1.0	4	1.7	6	4.0	16	8.4	29	3.23
Junior college	2	0.6	4	1.7	2	1.3	1	0.5	9	1.00
College	2	0.6	3	1.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	0.55
N(multiple responses) =	317		240		149		190		896	
Total %		100.0		100.0		100.0		99.8		99.95

Time Spent in Student Teaching

A wide variety of practices exist in the length of the student teaching period, ranging from as short as 2 to 4 weeks to as long as the entire year, from as few as two class periods daily to as many as the entire classroom day. About two-thirds of the institutions in the survey have programs in which the student teacher spends the entire day in the secondary school, most commonly for half a semester or an entire academic quarter. Spending half a day in the school for an entire semester is also a common practice. The only practice which would seem to show signs of promise for future practice, according to a significant index number, is that of student teaching for the entire day for an entire semester. Of the 360 responses to an "ideal" arrangement, eighty-six percent preferred the full-day plan.

Similarly, the number of hours of academic credit received for student teaching varies from no credit at all to as much as eighteen semester hours. In colleges which award semester hours of credit, the most common practice is six hours. In suggesting the ideal arrangement, respondents indicate a preference for six hours, but the practice of giving eight hours credit is considered the ideal more frequently than it is the practice. In schools with quarter hours, the more common amounts are twelve and fifteen hours of credit. Meaningful interpretation of data in Table 9 is difficult because of the variable number of hours that constitute a normal student load.

Presumably the length of time the student spends at the school is closely related to the number of hours of actual teaching he does. Here again, the range is wide--from less than 30 hours to more than 180. In about a fourth of the institutions, the typical student teacher spends between 90 and 119 hours teaching. The ideal arrangement differs significantly from the practice. A preponderance of the respondents have indicated that the ideal amount of actual teaching would be 180 or more hours. Such an amount would be possible, of course, in full-day plans covering most of an academic quarter or semester.

One possible explanation for the small amount of time spent by several students in actual teaching is the problem of their not becoming acquainted with the cooperating teacher and his classroom procedures until several weeks of the student teaching period have already been consumed. Ideally, according to the respondents, the student teacher and cooperating teacher would meet (and perhaps make tentative plans for the student teaching period) in the spring preceding the school year of student teaching, or at least during the first weeks of the school year in which student teaching is to occur. Especially strong, in view of the few institutions that carry on the practice, is the procedure of a tentative assignment's being made early in the student's academic career and occasional visits being made to that teacher's classroom prior to student teaching.

TABLE 8: AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS OF ACTUAL TEACHING DONE BY EACH STUDENT TEACHER IN ENGLISH

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
Less than 30	3	2.1	4	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	1.53	3	0.87	-	-
30 - 59 hours	12	8.2	13	7.8	9	13.2	8	10.8	42	9.23	11	3.22	12.90	-
60 - 89 hours	28	19.2	30	18.0	9	13.2	7	9.5	74	16.26	27	7.91	14.25	-
90 - 119 hours	40	27.4	44	26.3	14	20.6	15	20.3	113	24.83	68	19.94	3.81	1.25
120 - 149 hours	27	18.5	33	19.7	15	22.1	13	17.6	88	19.34	68	19.94	0.06	.97
150 - 179 hours	15	10.3	19	11.4	3	4.4	10	13.5	47	10.32	49	14.36	5.60	-
180 or more	21	14.3	24	14.4	18	26.5	21	28.4	84	18.46	115	33.72	33.59	.57
N =	146		167		68		74		455		341		78.21=	
Total %		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.1		99.97		99.96		
No response	3		1		4		2		10		114			

TABLE 9: NUMBER OF HOURS OF ACADEMIC CREDIT RECEIVED FOR STUDENT TEACHING

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students							
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
In Semester Hours (88.27% of responding institutions indicate credit in semester hours)														
2	2	1.6	4	3.3	0	0.0	1	1.8	7	2.11	0	0.00	-	-
3	3	2.7	3	2.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	1.81	4	2.09	-	-
4	1	0.8	0	0.0	2	5.1	0	0.0	3	0.90	2	1.05	-	-
5	2	1.6	3	2.7	0	0.0	1	1.8	6	1.81	3	1.57	-	-
6	74	62.1	78	65.5	20	51.2	17	31.4	189	57.10	87	45.55	4.44	1.25
6 2/3	1	0.8	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.60	0	0.00	-	-
7	1	0.8	0	0.0	2	0.0	2	3.7	5	1.51	3	1.57	-	-
8	27	22.6	16	13.4	9	23.0	14	25.9	66	19.93	49	25.65	3.18	0.78
8 1/3	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.30	0	0.00	-	-
5 - 8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.5	0	0.0	1	0.30	0	0.00	-	-
9	0	0.0	4	3.3	2	5.1	3	5.5	9	2.71	13	6.80	12.80	-
10	2	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	9.2	7	2.11	9	4.71	6.25	-
12	4	3.3	8	6.7	3	7.6	6	11.1	21	6.34	14	7.33	.28	-
9 - 12	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.30	3	1.57	-	-
15	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	7.4	4	1.20	3	1.57	-	-
16	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.8	1	0.30	1	0.52	-	-
18	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.30	0	0.00	-	-
no credit	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.30	0	0.00	-	-
N =	119		119		39		54		331		191		26.95=	
Total %		99.5		100.0		99.6		99.6		99.93		99.97		
In Quarter Hours (9.93% of responding institutions indicate credit in quarter hours)														
3	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.63	0	0.00	-	-
5	0	0.0	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.63	0	0.00	-	-
6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	0	0.0	1	2.63	0	0.00	-	-
8	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.63	0	0.00	-	-
9	0	0.0	2	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.26	1	4.00	-	-
10	1	12.5	2	25.0	1	8.3	1	10.0	5	13.15	1	4.00	-	-
12	4	50.0	1	12.5	3	25.0	4	40.0	12	31.57	16	64.00	8.00	0.49#
12 1/2	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.63	0	0.00	-	-
14	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	1	2.63	1	4.00	-	-
15	0	0.0	2	25.0	5	41.6	3	30.0	10	26.31	5	20.00	.57	1.31
16	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	16.6	1	10.0	3	2.89	1	4.00	-	-
N =	8		8		12		10		38		25		8.57	
Total %		100.0		100.0		99.8		100.0		99.96		100.00		
2 1/2 courses	2		0		0		0		2					
Other arrangements	4		0		0		0		4					
Grand Totals	133		127		51		64		375		216			
No response	16		41		21		12		90		249			

TABLE 10: OCCASION WHEN STUDENT TEACHER FIRST MEETS COOPERATING TEACHER

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
First weeks of semester or quarter in which student teaching takes place	68	43.3	75	40.1	29	37.7	34	41.0	206	41.03	69	19.94	37.53	2.06
Start of student teaching period	30	19.1	35	18.7	20	26.0	24	28.9	109	21.71	13	3.75	51.25	-
Spring preceding school year in which student teaching will be done	25	15.9	21	11.2	11	14.3	8	9.6	65	12.94	93	26.87	45.20	.48#
First weeks of the school year	14	9.0	31	16.6	9	11.7	10	12.0	65	12.94	81	23.41	31.11	.54
Quarter or semester prior to student teaching **	7	4.7	11	5.9	7	9.1	5	6.0	30	5.97	7	2.02	9.33	-
Observation of classes during student's earlier college years	5	3.2	12	6.4	1	1.3	1	1.2	19	3.75	81	23.41	355.69	-
Other arrangements*	6	318	2	1.1	0	0.0	1	1.2	9	1.79	2	0.57	-	-
Totals	157		187		77		83		502		346		530.11=	

*Other arrangements include teas and luncheons; several weeks before student teaching; annual institutes and workshops; upon request of the student teacher; during freshman orientation; the summer preceding internship

TABLE 11: LENGTH OF STUDENT TEACHING PERIOD

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
Full-day														
2 - 4 weeks	4	2.9	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	1.14	0	0.00	-	-
5 - 7 weeks	21	15.6	21	13.6	5	7.0	5	6.5	52	11.95	20	5.55	12.30	-
Half quarter	2	1.4	2	1.2	2	2.8	0	0.0	6	1.37	6	1.67	.20	-
Half semester	39	29.1	22	14.2	20	28.1	23	30.2	104	23.90	85	23.61	.01	1.01
Entire quarter	9	6.7	16	10.3	14	19.7	14	18.4	53	12.18	50	13.88	1.14	-
Entire semester	7	5.2	15	9.7	6	8.4	8	10.5	36	8.27	115	31.94	240.08	0.26#
Entire semester and summer	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.3	1	0.22	0	0.00	-	-
Entire year	1	1.2	2	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.68	15	4.16	62.40	-
Entire trimester	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.3	1	0.22	0	0.00	-	-
8 - 9 weeks	4	2.9	2	1.2	2	2.8	1	1.3	9	2.06	4	1.11	-	-
10 weeks	0	0.0	1	0.6	2	2.8	0	0.0	3	0.68	3	0.83	-	-
11 weeks	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4	0	0.0	1	0.22	0	0.00	-	-
12 weeks	1	0.7	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	1.3	3	0.68	0	0.00	-	-
13 weeks	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4	1	1.3	2	0.45	0	0.00	-	-
80% of semester	0	0.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.22	0	0.00	-	-
Two quarters	0	0.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.22	3	0.83	-	-
Totals	88		85		53		55		281		301			
Half-day														
5 - 7 weeks	1	0.7	1	0.6	2	2.8	1	1.3	5	1.14	2	0.55	-	-
9 weeks	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.45	0	0.00	-	-
Half semester	5	3.7	3	1.9	2	2.8	1	1.3	11	2.52	2	0.55	-	-
Entire quarter	1	0.7	13	8.4	2	2.8	3	3.9	19	4.36	7	1.94	4.66	-
Entire semester	30	22.3	44	28.5	9	12.6	16	21.0	88	22.75	38	10.55	23.61	2.16
12 weeks	0	0.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.22	2	0.55	-	-
Entire year	0	0.0	2	1.2	1	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.68	4	1.11	-	-
10 week trimester	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.22	0	0.00	-	-
Totals	40		64		16		21		54		55			
Other than Half-day														
2 hours/2 quarters	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4	0	0.0	1	0.22	0	0.00	-	-
2 hours/5 - 7 weeks	0	0.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.22	0	0.00	-	-
2 hours/semester	2	1.4	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.68	1	0.28	-	-
2 - 3 hours/semester	2	1.4	1	0.6	1	1.4	0	0.0	4	0.91	1	0.28	-	-
1 period/semester	0	0.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.22	0	0.00	-	-
3/4 day/quarter	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	1	0.28	-	-
3/5 day/semester	0	0.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.22	0	0.00	-	-
3 - 5 classes /quarter	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.22	1	0.28	-	-
2 hours weekly/semester	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.22	0	0.00	-	-
Totals	6		5		2		0		13		4			
N =	134		154		71		76		435		360		344.40=	
Total %		98.9		98.6		98.2		99.6		99.71		99.95		
No response	15		14		1		0		30		105			

Success and Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience

Far out-distancing other factors that influence success in student teaching is that of basic personality traits, according to a tabulation of responses. That factor and the one suggested second most often--general mental ability--are not particularly subject to the programs of instruction of either the education or English department except as they reflect the recruiting and admission policies of candidates to the English teacher preparation programs of the institutions. Similarly, the third most important factor--the helpfulness of the cooperating teacher--is not primarily the result of the strength or weakness of the institution's program but certainly reflects the importance of careful selection of capable persons to serve as cooperating teachers and of communicating to them the intentions of the college's program. The influences of course-related material in the institution's preparation program follow in importance--content background from English special methods, literature courses, language courses, and composition courses (in that order). Also relevant as a major influence is the teaching skill of the cooperating teacher.

Deemed the most significant item of observable behavior on the part of the student teacher in English is a general ability--that of creating an atmosphere for learning. Considered second most significant is the student teacher's knowledge of content material appropriate to the English classes he is teaching.

The final evaluation of the student teacher's work, decided most often by the college supervisor with assistance from the cooperating teacher, is usually translated into a letter on the traditional A-B-C scale. The grade is, in most situations, accompanied by written evaluations and completed checklists from both the supervising teacher and the cooperating teacher. Some dissatisfaction with the traditional letter grade, coupled with greater use of written evaluations, is indicated by statistical analysis of the current arrangements and the ideal practices.

TABLE 12: MAJOR INFLUENCES UPON THE SUCCESS OF STUDENT TEACHER IN ENGLISH

Rank	Influences	Total Ranking Points
1	Basic personality traits	831
2	General mental ability	451
3	Helpfulness of cooperating teacher	349
4	Background from English methods	255
5	Background from literature courses	192
6	Teaching skill of cooperating teacher	176
7	Background from language courses	169
8	Prior experience working with young people	84
9	Background from composition courses	76
10	Amount of supervision given by college	62
11	Background from educational psychology courses	60
12	Overall English program	5

Other factors receiving mention are these: knowledge of materials to be taught; careful placement of student teacher; having good moral standards; good high school and college English background; skill in motivating interest in English; dedication to the field of English; capacity to organize content material; general English background; admission to the college in general; devotion to needs of students of junior and senior high schools; resourcefulness; sense of humor; emotional maturity; ability to select and perform appropriate teaching strategy

N = 447

(Ranking points were determined on the basis of three points for the factor considered most important by the person completing the questionnaire, two points for the factor considered second most important, one point for third.)

TABLE 13: OBSERVABLE BEHAVIOR OF STUDENT TEACHERS CONSIDERED MOST SIGNIFICANT BY RESPONDENTS

Rank	Observable Behavior	Total Ranking Points
1	Ability to create atmosphere for learning	698
2	Apparent knowledge of content material necessary in English classes	546
3	Apparent imagination, resourcefulness	369
4	Skill at eliciting student response	235
5	Ability to control behavior of students in classrooms	179
6	Attention to individual differences	178
7	Self-confidence exhibited	174
8	Giving clear assignments	71
9	Awareness of students' English usage	56
10	Quality, projection of voice	49
11	Use of teaching aids	39
12	Attention to routine matters	37
13	Awareness of reading problems	31
14	Ability to construct tests	30
15	Evidence of careful planning **	8
16	Enthusiasm for subject **	5
17	Perception of student growth **	4
18	Methodology **	4
19	Conscientiousness about teaching responsibilities **	2

Other items receiving mention (all added by respondents) are these: ability to self-evaluate; rapport with students; ability to read with maturity and skill; knowledge of grammar and mechanics of English.

N = 443

(Ranking points were determined on the basis of three points for the item felt most important, two for the next most important, and one for the third most important.)

TABLE 14: KINDS OF EVALUATION DEVICES OF STUDENT TEACHERS

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
Traditional A-B-C System	113	21.9	127	23.2	48	18.9	54	19.4	342	21.46	78	7.69	91.65	-
Written evaluations by cooperating teacher	111	21.6	116	21.2	51	20.1	58	20.8	336	21.08	262	25.83	9.80	.82
Checklists by Co-operating teacher	109	21.2	106	19.4	53	20.8	51	18.3	319	20.01	198	19.52	.24	1.03
Written evaluations by supervisor	74	14.4	86	15.8	41	16.2	54	19.4	255	15.74	181	17.85	1.76	.88
Checklists by supervisor	75	14.6	86	15.8	40	15.7	38	13.6	239	14.99	162	15.97	.42	.94
No grades given	18	3.5	17	3.1	17	6.7	19	6.8	71	4.45	92	9.07	46.00	-
Letter or number system different from traditional A-B-C	6	1.2	7	1.3	3	1.2	5	1.8	21	1.32	30	2.95	22.23	-
Written evaluation by student teacher **	3	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.4	0	0.0	4	0.25	5	0.49	-	-
Written evaluation by principal **	2	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.13	2	0.19	-	-
Oral evaluation by supervisor **	2	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.13	1	0.09	-	-
Others *	2	0.4	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.19	3	0.29	-	-
N (multiple responses)=	515		546		254		279		1594		1014		172.1=	
Total %		100.2		100.0		100.0		100.1		99.75		99.94		

*Others include film clips and video tapes of students; checklist by director of student teaching; evaluation by English department

TABLE 15: PERSON(S) WHO DETERMINE FINAL EVALUATIVE GRADE OF STUDENT TEACHER

	Responses and Percentages of Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students							
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
Supervisor with much help from cooperating teacher	53	38.7	64	39.5	31	43.5	34	45.3	182	40.80	154	46.95	2.99	.87
Supervisor with some help from cooperating teacher	47	34.3	49	30.2	21	29.1	18	24.0	135	30.27	74	22.56	6.31	1.34
Cooperating teacher with some help from supervisor	13	9.5	20	12.3	8	11.1	4	5.3	45	10.09	39	11.89	1.09	-
College supervisor alone	4	2.9	6	3.7	6	8.3	5	6.7	21	4.68	13	3.96	.27	-
Cooperating teacher with much help from supervisor	8	5.8	9	5.6	0	0.0	3	4.0	20	4.46	24	7.31	5.40	-
Cooperating teacher alone	4	2.9	6	3.7	5	7.0	5	6.7	20	4.46	13	3.96	.27	-
English supervisor, education supervisor, cooperating teacher **	1	0.7	1	0.6	1	1.4	2	2.7	5	1.12	1	0.30	-	-
Supervisor, cooperating teacher, student teacher**	2	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.3	3	0.67	3	0.92	-	-
Principal **	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.3	2	0.45	1	0.30	-	-
General supervisor with advice from English supervisor and cooperating teacher **	1	0.7	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.45	2	0.60	-	-
Others*	3	2.1	6	3.7	0	0.0	2	2.7	11	2.45	4	1.21		-
N =	137		162		72		75		446		328		16.33	-
Total %		99.8		99.9		100.4		100.0		99.90		99.96		
No response	12		6		0		1		19		137			

*Others include these combinations of people: supervisor, head of education department, cooperating teacher; director of student teaching, supervisor, cooperating teacher; cooperating teacher, supervisor, other teachers in senior semester block; college supervisor, principal, cooperating teacher; supervisor, cooperating teacher, English faculty advisor, principal; supervisor, methods teacher, cooperating teacher, other members of education department; director of freshman English and chairman of English department; cooperating teacher and supervisor separately; director of secondary education with assistance from college supervisor; director of student teaching with some assistance from cooperating teacher; self-evaluation; conference.

Student Teaching and Methods Courses

There is statistical indication that there is some dissatisfaction with a general teaching methods course and a preference for a special English methods course. The tables, however, do not get at the specific situation in all schools. Some institutions have both special English methods courses and general teaching methods courses but which the respondent chose not to classify as a combination of general and English methods courses.

In a majority of institutions, student teaching occurs after the student has taken the methods course or courses. There is no great inclination on the part of the respondents to change the current arrangements except for a few vigorous spokesmen who suggested that student teaching should precede the methods course.

TABLE 16: TYPES OF METHODS COURSES FOR STUDENT TEACHERS IN ENGLISH

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
Special English methods	77	43.0	99	49.0	52	56.5	61	61.6	289	50.52	246	60.14	7.35	.84
General teaching methods	58	32.4	56	27.7	22	23.9	22	22.2	158	27.62	60	14.66	18.49	1.08
Combination of general and English methods	29	16.2	31	15.4	9	9.8	4	4.0	73	12.76	61	14.91	1.56	-
Language arts methods	11	6.1	15	7.4	9	9.8	10	10.1	45	7.86	40	9.77	2.00	-
No methods class	1	0.6	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	1.0	3	0.52	0	0.00	-	-
Others *	3	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	4	0.69	2	0.49	-	-
N (multiple responses) =	179		202		92		99		572		409		29.40=	
Total %		100.0		100.0		100.0		99.9		99.97		99.97		

*Others include private meetings and seminars; course covering content of English subject matter in secondary schools; part of a total workshop; laboratory experiences with teaching materials

TABLE 17: SEQUENTIAL RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENT TEACHING TO METHODS COURSE(S)

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
After methods course	97	63.3	116	61.4	50	48.5	51	57.3	314	58.80	210	55.85	.55	1.05
During same quarter, semester	54	35.3	66	34.9	47	45.6	27	30.3	194	36.32	139	36.96	.03	.98
Before methods course	2	1.3	7	3.7	6	5.8	11	12.4	26	4.86	27	7.18	4.50	-
N (multiple responses) =	153		189		103		89		534		376		5.08	
Total %		99.9		100.0		99.9		100.0		99.98		99.99		

Characteristics of Cooperating Teachers

Usage is divided on the matter of the appropriate term to use in designating the secondary school English teacher to whom the student teacher is assigned. Almost half the responses indicated use of the term "cooperating teacher." This plurality has prompted regular use of this term in this report. Following closely in number was the term "supervising teacher;" far behind were the terms "critic teacher" and "master teacher."

Selection of this cooperating teacher typically is made by a combination of persons with the secondary school principal, the person mentioned most often. This is consistent with the qualification mentioned most often for the cooperating teacher--the recommendation of the principal. Statistical analysis indicates that this practice is perhaps less than ideal or at least that the principal should be less important in the selection than he traditionally has been. The college director of student teaching, the college English supervisor, and the head of the secondary school English department also frequently make (or assist in making) the selection of cooperating teachers. Among other cooperating teacher qualifications often mentioned are these: at least two years of teaching experience, at least one year experience in the school system, an undergraduate degree in English, and a master's degree.

The term "state certification" in Table 20 is ambiguous. The term probably meant to some respondents the teacher's holding a state certificate to teach secondary school English; it may have meant to others the uncommon practice of a special state certification for those who serve as cooperating teachers.

The qualities of cooperating teachers considered most important by the respondents overwhelmingly are these three: skill in teaching, ability and interest in working with novice teachers, and dedication to the preparation of English teachers. All these factors, of course, are considered by most people to be important qualities of good cooperating teachers.

TABLE 18: TERM USED TO DESCRIBE THE SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHER WITH WHOM THE STUDENT TEACHER WORKS

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%		
Cooperating teacher	72	48.3	77	45.8	38	54.3	40	52.6	227	49.00
Supervising teacher	56	37.6	63	37.5	24	34.3	31	40.8	174	37.58
Critic teacher	15	10.1	15	8.9	4	5.9	4	5.3	38	8.20
Master teacher **	1	0.6	8	4.7	1	1.4	1	1.3	11	2.37
Resident teacher **	0	0.0	2	1.2	2	2.9	0	0.0	4	0.86
Clinical professor **	2	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.43
Others*	3	2.0	3	1.8	1	1.4	0	0.0	7	1.51
N =	149		168		70		76		463	
Total %		99.9		99.9		100.2		100.0		99.95
No response	0		0		2		0		2	

*Others include sponsor teacher, advisory teacher, observing teacher, English coordinator, university student teacher director, director of graduate teaching assistants

TABLE 19: SELECTORS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
Principal of secondary school	98	28.7	115	31.4	49	32.7	53	29.0	315	30.25	154	20.26	25.11	1.49
Director of student teaching	84	24.6	96	26.2	43	28.7	47	25.7	270	25.93	188	24.73	.41	1.05
College supervisor	44	12.9	59	16.1	24	16.0	34	18.6	161	15.46	195	25.65	52.00	.60
Head of secondary school English department	48	14.0	38	10.4	28	18.7	34	18.6	148	14.21	142	18.68	10.70	.76
Head of college education department	47	13.8	42	11.5	2	1.3	2	1.1	93	8.93	50	6.57	4.76	-
County, city superintendent **	10	2.9	11	3.0	0	0.0	8	4.8	29	2.78	10	1.31	5.76	-
School supervisors, coordinators **	8	2.3	2	0.6	2	1.3	0	0.0	12	1.15	13	1.71	1.78	-
Head of college English department **	2	0.6	2	0.6	1	0.7	0	0.0	5	0.48	3	0.39	-	-
English education specialist **	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.1	2	0.19	4	0.52	-	-
Major adviser **	-	-	1	0.3	1	0.7	-	-	2	0.19	0	0.00	-	-
Others *	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	3	1.8	4	0.36	1	0.13	-	-
N(multiple responses) =	342		366		150		183		1041		760		100.52=	
Total %		100.1		100.1		100.1		100.7		99.93		99.95		

*Others include the supervisor of student teachers in the public school; the district curriculum director; previous student teachers

TABLE 20: BASIC QUALIFICATIONS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
Recommendation of principal	115	25.4	151	30.8	55	27.9	57	23.6	378	27.35	198	15.14	71.51	1.81
Teaching experience (at least two years)	82	18.1	94	19.2	37	18.8	48	19.8	261	18.88	182	13.91	17.10	1.36
Undergraduate major in English	64	14.1	70	14.3	25	12.7	31	12.8	190	13.74	150	11.47	5.00	-
Experience in school system (at least one year)	41	9.1	40	8.2	23	11.7	24	9.9	128	9.26	81	6.19	13.22	-
Master's degree	44	9.7	32	6.5	19	9.6	23	9.5	118	8.53	204	15.59	75.57	
Graduate work in English	26	5.7	36	7.4	18	9.1	17	7.0	97	7.01	194	14.83	113.09	-
Graduate course in supervision	42	9.3	17	3.5	3	1.5	7	2.9	69	4.99	114	8.71	36.94	-
State certification	14	3.1	27	5.5	7	3.6	11	4.5	59	4.26	115	8.79	62.16	-
Course work beyond Master's	7	1.5	12	2.5	1	0.5	9	3.7	29	2.09	55	4.20	29.04	-
Desire to work with student teachers **	3	0.7	1	0.2	5	2.5	6	2.5	15	1.08	3	0.22	-	-
Availability **	1	0.2	5	1.0	1	0.5	0	0.0	7	0.50	0	0.00	-	-
Recognized teaching skill, competence **	3	0.7	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.28	0	0.00	-	-
Bachelor's degree **	0	0.0	1	0.2	2	1.0	1	0.4	4	0.28	1	0.7	-	-
Certified in teaching field **	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.5	2	0.8	4	0.28	2	0.15	-	-
Recommendation of English supervisor at college**	1	0.2	3	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.28	3	0.22	-	-
Orientation to college program **	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.2	3	0.22	2	0.15	-	-
Recommendation of secondary department head **	2	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.14	0	0.00	-	-
A strong minor in English **	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.2	3	0.22	2	0.15	-	-
Others*	7	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	0.50	2	0.15	-	-
N(multiple responses) =	453		490		197		242		1382		1308		423.63=	
Total %		100.0		100.1		99.9		99.8		99.89		99.93		

*Others include attendance at NDEA institute, college observation and judgment of teacher's work, personality of the teacher, workshop participating, creativity of teacher, awareness of teaching principles.

TABLE 21: QUALITIES OF COOPERATING TEACHERS CONSIDERED MOST SIGNIFICANT

Rank		Total Ranking Points
1	Skill in teaching	599
2	Ability to work with novice teachers	488
3	Dedication to the training of prospective English teachers	367
4	Professional attitude	186
5	Tact, courtesy in dealing with individuals	185
6	Emotional maturity	164
7	Ability to control classroom	137
8	Knowledge of literature	106
9	Knowledge of methodology	93
10	Knowledge of language	86
11	Sense of humor	67
12	Knowledge of composition skills	63
13	Stress on importance of the individual student **	4

N = 424

(Ranking points were determined on the basis of three points for the quality felt most important, two for the next most important, and one for the third most important.)

Training and Benefits

Many colleges and universities provide their cooperating teachers with a variety of items and activities designed to assist the teacher in working with a student teacher. Among the things usually provided are handbooks and dinner meetings or other social events. Somewhat less common in use are workshops, graduate courses in supervision, and newsletters. The idea of a workshop for cooperating teachers is a practice that may be considered a promising trend for the future.

The five highest ranking items listed in Table 22 are those suggested on the questionnaire. The other items are among those written in by respondents. The listing of these additional items in the table should not be misinterpreted. Most colleges and universities probably provide personal data sheets on student teachers for their cooperating teachers. Eight respondents consider this to be an item of preparation and added it to the questionnaire items. Similarly, most colleges probably provide some kind of interview and discussion between college personnel and cooperating teachers. The exact nature of the distinction between the written-in "inservice workshop" and the already listed "workshop" is unknown, but presumably the respondents felt the need to distinguish between them.

Benefits other than preparation for the task are provided to most cooperating teachers. Generally a small honorarium is paid by the college. Usually the full amount listed in Table 24 is awarded to the teacher. Occasionally, however, the payment is made by the college to the school system which may or may not share it with the cooperating teacher. The table makes no distinction of this type. Probably the larger amounts listed are paid by schools involved in intern programs. Although no ideal was asked for on the questionnaire, several respondents mentioned that the amount paid by their schools was not as much as should be paid. The amount most frequently paid is $50 per student teacher. About the same number of schools pay $75 and $25. A few institutions pay more to teachers with master's degrees than to those with only a bachelor's.

A precise distinction between "exemption from tuition" and "privilege of taking graduate courses" in Table 23 is difficult to make. "Privilege" may indicate something less than full exemption from tuition costs for the cooperating teacher. At any rate, these two items plus that of tickets for college events are the most commonly awarded benefits. Respondents of forty institutions indicated that no other benefits except money are awarded; perhaps other institutions which did not respond to the question would also fit into that category.

The questions concerning fringe benefits and items of preparation given to cooperating teachers are the only ones in the entire questionnaire which received more markings of "ideal" than those of current practice. The three benefits mentioned in the preceding paragraph were listed as "ideal" in about the same proportions as in practice. A clearly significant contrast between practice and ideal is found, however, in the matter of reduced teaching load for the cooperating teacher. Except in situations in which the college or university pays a proportionate amount of the cooperating teacher's salary (such as in resident centers), the practice is rare. Ideal as the arrangement may be, the practice is largely outside the authority of the college or university to request. Perhaps greater articulation would help evolve a plan whereby the cooperating teachers' work with student teachers would be acknowledged by a reduction in teaching load.

Also receiving considerable support as an "ideal" and more properly within the domain of the college is the granting of academic rank within the college faculty to the cooperating teacher. A somewhat less prestigious benefit is that of listing the cooperating teacher in the college catalogue.

The term "library privileges" was not included in the original questionnaire but was written in by several respondents. The practice is probably more common than the number would indicate.

TABLE 22: ITEMS OF TRAINING GIVEN ENGLISH COOPERATING TEACHERS BY THE COLLEGE

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students							
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
Handbook	94	40.0	71	30.2	54	45.8	62	38.5	281	37.51	237	25.45	7.29	1.47
Dinner meeting, other social evene	74	31.5	76	32.3	21	17.8	28	17.4	199	26.56	166	17.83	26.56	1.49
Workshop	18	7.7	30	12.8	16	13.1	24	14.9	88	11.74	265	28.46	223.27	.41
Graduate level course in supervision	9	3.8	22	9.4	14	11.9	25	15.5	70	9.34	147	15.78	41.38	-
Newsletter	17	7.2	27	11.5	10	8.5	12	7.5	66	8.81	99	10.63	3.52	-
On-campus conferences, institutes **	9	3.8	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.6	11	1.47	7	0.75	1.45	-
Seminars **	1	0.4	1	0.4	3	2.5	3	1.9	8	1.06	1	0.10	-	-
Orientation meeting **	1	0.4	3	1.3	0	0.0	1	0.6	5	0.66	2	0.21	-	-
In-service workshop **	-	-	1	0.4	-	-	1	0.6	2	0.27	-	-	-	-
Interviews and discussions **	3	1.3	1	0.4	-	-	-	-	4	0.53	2	0.21	-	-
Personal data on Student teachers **	4	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	0.53	2	0.21	-	-
Others *	5	2.1	2	0.8	-	-	4	2.5	11	1.47	2	0.21	-	-
N(multiple responses)=	235		235		118		161		749		931		303.47=	
Total %		99.8		99.9		99.6		100.0		99.95		99.84		

*Others include participation in curriculum revision; student teacher handbook; one free course in graduate program; office meetings; teachers' meetings; formal tea; special high school methods instruction; state certification; attendance at AST meetings.

TABLE 23: BENEFITS AWARDED TO COOPERATING TEACHERS BESIDES MONEY

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
Exemption from tuition	16	19.5	24	20.9	13	21.3	16	23.5	69	21.23	124	17.34	5.16	1.22
Privilege of taking graduate courses	12	14.6	18	15.6	20	32.8	16	23.5	66	20.24	114	15.94	6.63	1.26
Tickets for college events	25	30.5	27	23.5	4	6.6	8	11.8	64	19.63	103	14.40	9.78	1.36
None **	8	9.8	17	14.8	7	11.5	8	11.8	40	12.26	-	-	-	-
Reduced teaching load in secondary school	2	2.4	8	7.0	4	6.6	4	5.9	18	5.52	215	30.06	794.26	0.18#
Academic rank in college	3	3.7	6	5.3	4	6.6	3	4.4	16	4.90	81	11.32	60.46	
Library privileges **	3	3.7	5	4.4	2	3.3	4	5.9	14	4.29	11	1.53	12.90	-
Listing in catalogue **	1	1.2	5	4.4	2	3.3	4	5.9	12	3.68	7	0.97	13.88	-
Reduction of tuition	3	3.7	3	2.6	3	4.9	2	2.9	11	3.37	53	7.41	35.04	-
Others*	9	11.0	2	1.7	2	3.3	3	4.4	16	4.90	7	0.97	22.40	-
N(multiple responses)=	82		115		61		68		326		715		960.51=	
Total %		100.1		100.2		100.2		100.0		100.02		99.94		

[*] Others include use of curriculum materials center, workshops, dinners and gifts, special certificate from the state, voucher for four college courses, tuition for children of cooperating teacher, supervision course with no tuition charge.

TABLE 24: HONORARIA PAID SCHOOL SYSTEMS AND/OR COOPERATING TEACHERS FOR WORKING WITH A STUDENT TEACHER

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students			
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Total	%
$15	2	1.7	5	4.0	1	2.3	0	0.0	8	2.3
$15 - $25	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
$20	4	3.0	2	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	1.7
$25	14	12.2	9	7.3	5	11.6	5	7.7	33	9.5
$25 - $50	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5	1	0.3
$30	9	7.8	9	7.3	0	0.0	2	3.1	20	5.8
$30 - $60	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
$32.50	0	0.0	2	1.6	0	0.0	2	3.1	4	1.2
$33.50	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
$35	2	1.7	7	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	2.6
$40	11	9.6	3	2.4	2	4.7	3	4.6	19	5.5
$45	1	0.9	3	2.4	1	2.3	1	1.5	6	1.7
$48	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	2	3.1	3	0.9
$50	30	26.1	25	20.2	8	18.6	10	15.4	73	21.0
$56	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
$60	7	6.1	4	3.2	2	4.7	1	1.5	14	4.0
$65	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
$70	2	1.7	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.9
$72	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
$75	7	6.1	12	9.7	6	14.0	7	10.8	32	9.2
$80	1	0.9	2	1.6	1	2.3	1	1.5	5	1.4
$90	0	0.0	6	4.8	1	2.3	4	6.2	11	3.2
$100	1	0.9	9	7.3	4	9.3	0	0.0	14	4.0
$75 - $100	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5	1	0.3
$120	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5	2	0.6
$150	0	0.0	2	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.6
$200	0	0.0	3	2.4	1	2.3	0	0.0	4	1.2
$500	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	0	0.0	1	0.3
up to $1,000	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
$1,200	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
$1/credit hour	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5	1	0.3
$5/credit hour	1	0.9	1	0.8	1	2.3	0	0.0	3	0.9
$6/credit hour	1	0.9	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.6
$7/credit hour	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
$8/credit hour	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	1	1.5	2	0.6
$9/credit hour	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
$10/credit hour	2	1.7	1	0.8	0	0.0	3	4.6	6	1.7
$12/credit hour	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	1	1.5	2	0.6
$20/credit hour	2	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5	3	0.9
$25/credit hour	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Money awarded, but amount unlisted	9	7.8	10	8.1	8	18.6	14	21.6	41	11.8
Others *	1	0.9	1	0.8	0	0.0	3	4.6	5	1.4
N =	115		124		43		65		347	
Total %		100.3		99.9		99.9		99.8		100.0
No response	34		44		29		11		118	

*Others include $30 or $5/credit hour; $720 for 9 months service; 20% of regular semester salary; being considered

College Supervisors

Qualifications

Despite the common thought that graduate assistants do practically all of the supervision of English student teachers, the survey indicates that the type of person who most often supervises is a member of the education department and one who holds a professorial rank. Even in the larger universities (which presumably use more graduate assistants as supervisors) the education department faculty member is the most common type of supervisor. It must be added, however, that most respondents indicated that more than one kind of person is involved in actual supervision--education professors, English professors, assistants in both fields. The respondents did not indicate the amount of supervision done by these people, only whether or not persons in these classifications are involved. Also missing from the compiled data is any indication of whether the education department supervisors of English teachers are general secondary supervisors or English teaching supervisors.

In response to a question asking whether or not the supervisor(s) of English student teachers had had experience themselves as teachers of secondary school English, a majority in each classification had done so. The author of the report feels, however, that the tabulated responses for this item may be misleading because of a possible ambiguity in the question. An indication of this can be found in an examination of the rather large figure listed in the category of directors of student teaching who have taught secondary school English. A percentage of 63.7 of directors of student teaching were listed as having had teaching experience in secondary school English. Unless an unusually large number of college directors of student teaching have come from the ranks of English teachers, the number seems unlikely. Possibly some of the respondents read the item as asking, "with teaching experience in secondary schools."

Fifty percent of the respondents indicated that they felt that experience in teaching secondary school English was an essential qualification for the supervisors of English student teaching. Another 44 percent indicated that they felt it to be a desirable qualification.

Consistent with the finding that 94 percent of the respondents felt that experience as a secondary school English teacher is essential or desirable is that this trait is at the top of the list of qualifications for English supervisors. This list in Table 27 should not be interpreted to mean that the items lower in the rankings are not important traits for the English supervisor. All are important. Several of the respondents wrote marginal notes expressing this idea and their difficulty in limiting their selection to five items. The tabulation, however, gets at which of the qualifications are considered somewhat more relevant than the others by the composite respondent. The top five qualifications show considerably more strength than other items in the list.

The English supervisor's relationship to the methods course is most likely to be that of teacher of the special English methods course. Somewhat less common is his teaching of the general methods course. Just how many of those in the latter group are specialists in English education is unknown. Probably few. Too common a practice according to the contrast with the ideal arrangement is that supervisors have no association with either type of methods course. That the supervisor should teach the English special methods course received strong support.

TABLE 25: PROFESSIONAL STATUS OF SUPERVISORS OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN ENGLISH

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%		
Education department member with professorial rank	71	28.7	82	30.0	49	38.9	44	33.3	246	31.61
Director of student teaching	79	31.6	82	30.0	19	15.1	23	17.4	203	26.09
English department member with professorial rank	40	16.5	43	15.7	17	13.5	17	12.9	117	15.03
Appointment in English and education with professorial rank	15	6.0	24	8.8	24	19.0	10	7.6	73	9.38
Graduate assistant in English	21	8.5	18	6.6	4	3.2	11	8.3	54	6.94
Graduate assistant in education	2	0.8	4	1.4	8	6.3	19	14.4	33	4.24
Head of English department	18	7.3	14	5.1	5	3.9	1	0.8	38	4.88
Former high school teachers **	0	0.0	1	0.4	0	0.0	7	5.3	8	1.02
Others *	1	0.4	5	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.77
N(multiple responses)=	247		273		126		132		778	
Total %		99.8		99.5		99.9		100.0		99.96

*Others include a former secondary supervisor, a local school employee assigned to the university, a master teacher, a professor of economics, a director of freshman composition, a retired teacher

TABLE 26: RESPONDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD IMPORTANCE OF SUPERVISORS' HAVING HAD EXPERIENCE IN TEACHING SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%		
Essential	64	43.2	82	48.8	37	51.3	49	64.4	232	50.00
Desirable	72	48.6	77	45.8	33	45.8	22	28.9	204	43.96
Not of major importance	12	8.1	9	5.3	2	2.7	5	6.5	28	6.04
N =	148		168		72		76		464	
Total %		99.9		99.9		99.8		99.8		100.00
No response	1		0		0		0		1	

TABLE 27: QUALIFICATIONS OF SUPERVISORS OF ENGLISH STUDENT TEACHERS CONSIDERED MOST SIGNIFICANT

Rank		Total Ranking Points
1	Experience as a secondary English teacher	1222
2	Dedication to the training of prospective English teachers	1181
3	Knowledge of effective ways to teach English	968
4	Thorough understanding of the learning process	903
5	Knowledge of content, materials, and organization of English programs	805
6	Undergraduate major in English	241
7	Master's degree	174
8	Knowledge of the development of the English language	118
9	Ability to recognize good writing	112
10	Membership in professional organizations	109
11	Experience as a college English teacher	106
12	Knowledge of recent findings in linguistics	96
13	Interest in carrying on research	83
14	Knowledge of important works of major authors	68
15	Doctoral degree in education	67
16	Doctoral degree in English	64
17	Knowledge of theories of literary criticism	57
18	Skill in working with cooperating teachers, student teachers **	25
19	Publication in professional journals	14
20	Tact, diplomacy, sensitivity **	10

N = 429

Other qualifications receiving mention are these: respect for language and literature; self-knowledge; composite knowledge of English subject matter; thorough knowledge of people and their individual needs and differences; ability to work as supervisor and consultant; professional outlook and attitude.

(Ranking points were determined on the basis of five points for the quality felt most important by the person completing the questionnaire, four points for the quality felt second most important, three for third, etc.)

TABLE 28: RELATIONSHIP OF COLLEGE SUPERVISOR TO METHODS COURSE

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
Usually teaches English methods	44	27.6	63	31.5	33	39.7	33	38.3	173	32.76	184	46.5	23.45	.70
Teaches general methods course	66	41.5	67	33.5	13	15.5	11	12.7	157	29.73	104	26.7	1.44	1.11
Has no particular connection with either methods course	29	18.2	30	15.0	20	24.2	20	23.2	99	18.75	8	2.0	58.86	-
Sometimes teaches English methods	5	3.1	18	9.0	12	14.4	15	17.4	50	9.46	21	5.3	7.92	-
Assists in English methods	8	5.0	17	8.5	4	4.8	6	6.9	35	6.62	45	11.3	13.88	-
Assists in general methods	7	4.4	5	2.5	1	1.2	1	1.1	14	2.65	33	8.4	52.90	-
N(multiple responses) =	159		200		83		86		528		395		157.45=	
Total %		99.8		100.0		99.8		99.6		99.97		100.2		

Credit for Supervision

In more than forty percent of the institutions surveyed, each supervisor is assigned thirteen or more teachers during the student teaching period. According to data in Table 29, schools with more than fifty English student teachers each year are more likely to require this heavy work-load than are smaller schools. Perhaps this may be interpreted to mean that many of these larger institutions have supervisors whose duties are full-time or nearly full-time or that these larger schools tend to give less teaching load credit for supervision. No real determination can be gained from the available data. Thought to be ideal by a plurality of the respondents is a supervisory load of from five to eight students. Only in the "13 or more" category, however, is there any really substantial difference between the ideal and the practice.

There is wide variation in the amount of teaching load credit given for the supervision of student teachers in English. The credit is granted in some institutions on the basis of teaching-hour credit per number of students. Other institutions grant a standard amount of teaching credit for the supervision regardless of the number of student teachers involved. Still other institutions, according to the questionnaire responses, think in terms of supervision as a full-time task with a specified number of student teachers. Translating these multiple responses into a meaningful table has been difficult. Even more difficult to place into any meaningful data-table has been the suggestion of what the ideal credit would be. In fact, the responses have been so few and unclassifiable that no attempt has been made to include the "ideal" in the table and statistical tests.

This failure of the questionnaire to get clearly at this key element in supervision programs is unfortunate. About all that can be said about the difference between practice and ideal is that the respondents who did answer feel, in general, that an inadequate amount of teaching credit is given for supervision. The single most common suggestion is that one hour of credit should be given for each person supervised.

TABLE 29: NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS USUALLY ASSIGNED TO EACH SUPERVISOR

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
1 - 4	37	26.1	21	13.3	9	13.8	3	4.4	70	16.24	74	24.58	14.80	0.66
5 - 8	27	19.0	30	19.1	16	24.6	7	10.4	80	18.56	90	29.90	20.64	0.63
9 - 12	24	16.9	49	31.2	12	18.4	14	20.8	99	22.96	84	27.90	3.26	0.82
13 or more	54	38.0	57	36.3	28	43.0	41	61.1	180	41.76	52	17.27	45.63	2.41
Highly variable **	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2.9	2	0.46	1	0.33	-	-
N =	142		157		65		67		431		301		84.33=	
Total %		100.0		99.9		99.8		99.6		100.18		99.98		
No response	7		11		7		9		34		164			

TABLE 30: FACULTY TEACHING LOAD CREDIT FOR SUPERVISING STUDENT TEACHERS

	Number of colleges
A - one hour teaching credit for supervising number of student teachers listed below	
.5	1
.8	1
1	6
1.25	2
1.33	6
1.37	1
1.5	1
1.67	7
1.87	1
2	46
2.33	3
2.5	7
2.67	6
3	17
3.33	4
3.67	1
4	5
5	2
6	1
B - 1 student = 1/8 load	1
4 students = 1/4 load	1
5 students = 1/4 load	1
6 students = 1/3 load	1
8 students = 1/3 load	1
6 students = 1/2 load	1
10 students = 1/2 load	1
20 students = 3/4 load	1
C - one course teaching credit for supervising number of student teachers listed below	
5	1
5 - 8	3
6	3
7	1
12	1
D - teaching credit in amounts listed below for total set of student teachers	
2 hours	1
3 hours	11
4 hours	1
5 hours	1
6 hours	23
8 hours	3
9 hours	11
12 hours	3
15 - 16 quarter hours	3
one course	9
two courses	3
1/4 load	2
1/3 load	1
1/2 load	8
3/4 load	1
full load	1

TABLE 30: FACULTY TEACHING LOAD CREDIT FOR SUPERVISING STUDENT TEACHERS (CONTINUED)

	Number of colleges
E - usual number of students of supervisor on full-time basis	
11	1
9 - 15	1
18	1
20	10
15 - 20	2
24	2
20 - 25	2
25	1
22	3
12	1
F - miscellaneous arrangements	
no credit for supervision	15
no standard	4
extra pay	1
supervision a part of methods	1
1 hour credit = 8 visits	1

Total questionnaires responding to this item - 265
Total questionnaires not responding to this item - 200

Activities of Supervision

More than 45 percent of the respondents indicated that five or more seminar sessions are usually held during the student teaching period. Presumably the distance of the secondary school from the college and the general arrangements within the program affect the number of such get-togethers. However, all in all, the practice of several seminar sessions is generally felt to be of value.

On the matter of distance of the secondary school from the college, about one in twelve respondents would prefer that supervisors travel no more than a mile from the college. More than half the respondents, probably more realistic, indicated that the ideal maximum distance is from 5 to 9 miles or from 10 to 19 miles.

Almost 60 percent of the supervisors make four or fewer visits to the secondary school during the student teaching period. More than 70 percent see the student teacher actually teach for five or fewer hours. Promising trends indicate that the supervisor should visit the school at least seven times and observe the student teacher for at least ten hours. This trend, of course, is very dependent upon the amount of teaching load credit given for supervision.

The three or four consultations between a supervisor and student teacher, although common, seem hardly adequate to the respondents, half of whom feel that there should be at least seven get-togethers lasting about an hour each. The amount of time spent by the supervisor and the cooperating teacher, in both practice and ideal, is somewhat less. A clear-cut analysis cannot be made in the matter of the type of conference the supervisor holds to discuss and evaluate the work of the student teacher. A review of the suggested ideal arrangement seems to indicate that the respondents would prefer meeting separately with the cooperating teacher and the student teacher rather than meeting with them together.

In response to a question asking whether the student teacher is ever visited by another college faculty member besides the regular supervisor or supervisors, a preponderance--394 or 87.16 percent--answered in the negative. In a total of 58 other institutions, other college faculty members (usually English professors) visit occasionally.

Slightly more than 80 percent of the respondents indicated that their institutions do not provide any kind of continuing supervision of or assistance to the student teacher after he has completed the teacher preparation program. Of the 19.4 percent which indicated that they do have some sort of follow-up program, those items mentioned at least twice include these: visit by college personnel in the former student's first teaching job; follow-up surveys and questionnaires; occasional seminars; yearly meeting of alumni; counseling by mail and visit; consultant service; annual workshop each autumn; and job placement. Job placement was listed by respondents in a few institutions, but presumably is carried on in practically all schools.

TABLE 31: NUMBER OF SEMINAR SESSIONS NORMALLY HELD DURING STUDENT TEACHING PERIOD

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
0	31	21.8	24	15.7	22	30.6	18	24.0	95	21.49	7	2.28	52.74	-
1	17	12.0	17	11.1	13	18.1	8	10.7	55	12.44	10	3.26	20.63	-
2	10	7.0	14	9.2	4	5.6	6	8.0	34	7.69	36	11.76	6.00	-
3	10	7.0	8	5.2	6	8.3	4	5.3	28	6.33	38	12.41	19.00	-
4	14	9.9	4	2.6	3	4.2	6	8.0	27	6.10	28	9.15	4.26	-
5 or more	60	42.3	86	56.2	24	33.3	33	44.0	203	45.92	187	61.11	15.01	.75
N =	142		153		72		75		442		306		117.64=	
Total %		100.0		100.0		100.1		100.0		99.97		99.96		
No response	7		15		0		1		23		159			

TABLE 32: FARTHEST DISTANCE (ONE-WAY) ENGLISH SUPERVISOR TRAVELS TO VISIT STUDENT TEACHERS

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
Less than one mile	3	2.1	5	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	1.75	37	12.8	204.80	-
1 - 4 miles	19	13.2	10	5.9	3	4.2	2	2.7	34	7.45	29	10.0	3.05	-
5 - 9 miles	26	18.1	18	10.7	6	8.4	4	5.4	54	11.84	75	26.0	49.44	.46#
10 - 19 miles	34	23.6	41	24.5	10	14.0	13	17.5	98	21.49	70	24.6	1.03	.87
20 - 39 miles	38	26.4	48	28.7	18	15.3	15	20.2	119	26.09	57	19.7	4.32	1.32
40 - 79 miles	15	10.4	26	15.5	19	26.7	20	27.0	80	17.54	17	5.9	22.67	-
More than 80 miles	9	6.2	19	11.3	15	21.1	20	27.0	63	13.81	3	1.6	34.23	-
N =	144		167		71		74		456		288		319.54=	
Total %		100.0		100.5		99.7		99.8		99.97		100.6		
No response	5		1		1		2		9		177			

TABLE 33: NUMBER OF VISITS EACH SUPERVISOR NORMALLY MAKES TO STUDENT TEACHER'S SCHOOL

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
1 - 2	30	21.6	29	17.3	6	8.5	5	6.6	70	15.45	7	2.25	35.02	-
3 - 4	61	43.9	70	41.7	32	45.7	36	47.4	199	43.92	92	29.58	14.78	1.48
5 - 6	31	22.3	43	25.6	17	24.2	27	35.5	118	26.04	114	36.65	13.44	.71
7 or more	17	12.2	26	15.5	15	21.4	8	10.5	66	14.56	98	31.51	62.42	.46#
N =	139		168		70		76		453		311		125.66=	
Total %		100.0		100.1		99.8		100.0		99.97		99.99		
No response	10		0		2		0		12		154			

TABLE 34: TOTAL NUMBER OF HOURS THE ENGLISH SUPERVISOR SPENDS OBSERVING EACH STUDENT TEACHER IN ACTUAL TEACHING

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students							
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
0 - 1	9	6.9	4	2.5	7	10.0	4	5.3	24	5.29	5	1.64	24.20	-
2 - 3	54	37.0	56	34.8	11	15.7	16	21.0	137	30.24	22	7.23	22.27	4.18
4 - 5	48	32.9	51	31.7	29	41.4	30	39.5	158	34.87	89	29.27	17.00	1.19
6 - 7	21	14.4	25	15.5	9	12.8	15	19.7	70	15.45	70	23.02	11.26	.67
8 - 9	4	2.7	16	9.9	9	12.8	5	6.6	34	7.50	44	14.47	19.17	-
10 or more	10	6.7	9	5.6	5	7.1	6	7.9	30	6.62	73	24.01	140.45	.28
Depends on needs of student teacher **	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.32	-	-
N =	146		161		70		76		453		304		234.35=	
Total %		100.6		100.0		99.8		100.0		99.97		99.96		
No response	3		7		2		0		12		161			

TABLE 35: NUMBER OF CONSULTATIONS OF SUPERVISOR WITH EACH STUDENT TEACHER

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students							
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Total	%	Ideal	%	X^2	Index
None	2	1.3	0	0.0	1	1.4	0	0.0	3	0.66	0	0.0	-	-
1 - 2	20	13.4	23	14.1	3	4.3	4	5.6	50	11.03	6	1.7	25.97	-
3 - 4	60	40.2	49	30.1	31	44.3	25	35.2	165	36.42	74	22.0	18.89	1.66
5 - 6	32	21.4	39	23.9	16	22.8	23	32.4	110	24.28	85	25.2	.11	.96
7 or more	34	22.8	52	31.8	19	27.1	19	26.8	124	27.37	167	49.7	61.14	.55
Varies **	1	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.22	1	0.29	-	-
As needed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0.89	-	-
N =	149		163		70		71		453		336		106.11=	
Total %		99.8		99.9		99.9		100.0		99.98		99.78		
No response	0		5		2		5		12		129			

TABLE 36: AVERAGE TOTAL HOURS THAT SUPERVISOR SPENDS CONFERRING WITH EACH ENGLISH STUDENT TEACHER

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	x^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
0 - 1	15	10.4	14	8.6	7	10.1	4	5.8	40	9.00	3	0.9	.32	-
2 - 3	49	34.0	54	33.4	15	21.7	19	27.5	137	30.85	30	9.4	46.28	3.28
4 - 5	43	29.8	29	17.9	26	37.7	25	36.2	123	27.70	106	33.5	3.68	.83
6 - 7	19	13.1	26	15.9	8	11.6	6	8.7	59	13.28	60	18.9	7.71	.70
8 - 9	7	4.8	17	10.4	5	7.2	4	5.8	33	7.43	30	9.4	2.13	.79
10 or more	10	6.9	21	12.9	8	11.6	11	15.9	50	11.26	84	26.6	64.00	.42#
Variable, as needed **	1	0.7	1	0.6	-	-	-	-	2	0.44	2	1.4	-	-
N =	144		162		69		69		444		316		124.12=	
Total %		99.7		99.7		99.9		99.9		99.96		100.1		
No response	5		6		3		7		21		149			

TABLE 37: LOCATION OF THE SUPERVISOR'S CONSULTATIONS WITH STUDENT TEACHERS

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%	Ideal	%	x^2	Index
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%						
The school	81	49.6	146	58.6	58	65.9	65	65.0	350	58.33	223	56.4	.21	1.03
The supervisor's office	79	48.4	89	36.1	23	26.1	30	30.0	221	36.88	161	40.7	1.77	.91
A seminar room **	1	0.6	4	1.6	5	5.7	3	3.0	13	2.16	6	1.5	1.00	-
At lunch, coffee **	1	0.6	2	0.8	1	1.1	0	0.0	4	0.66	2	0.5	-	-
Via telephone **	0	0.0	4	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.66	1	0.25	-	-
At supervisor's home **	1	0.6	2	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.50	1	0.25	-	-
In college education department **	0	0.0	2	0.8	1	1.1	2	2.0	5	0.82	1	0.25	-	-
N(multiple responses)=	163		249		88		100		600		395		2.98	
Total %		99.8		100.3		99.9		100.0		100.01		99.94		

TABLE 38: USUAL NUMBER OF CONSULTATIONS OF SUPERVISOR WITH COOPERATING TEACHER

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students							
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Total	%	Ideal	%	x^2	Index
0	0	0.0	3	1.9	2	2.8	0	0.0	5	1.12	0	0.0	-	-
1 - 2	48	34.3	50	31.3	17	23.6	13	17.8	123	28.76	29	8.81	45.85	3.26
3 - 4	63	45.0	66	41.3	32	44.4	34	46.6	195	43.82	125	37.99	2.51	1.15
5 - 6	17	12.1	34	21.3	13	18.1	14	19.2	78	17.52	96	29.17	24.90	.60
7 or more	11	7.9	7	4.4	8	11.1	12	16.4	38	8.53	78	23.70	89.29	.36
Varies, as needed **	1	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.22	1	0.30	-	-
N =	140		160		72		73		445		329		162.55=	
Total %		100.0		100.2		100.0		100.0		99.97		99.97		
No response	9		8		0		3		20		136			

TABLE 39: ADDITIONAL PERSONS PRESENT WHEN SUPERVISOR AND COOPERATING TEACHER CONFER

	Responses and Percentages for Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs													
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students							
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Total	%	Ideal	%	x^2	Index
No one else	112	59.9	150	64.9	60	61.2	57	53.3	379	60.83	175	46.66	8.14	1.30
The student teacher	60	32.1	65	28.1	34	34.7	39	36.5	198	31.78	131	34.93	1.21	.91
The principal	12	6.4	14	6.1	3	3.1	8	7.5	37	5.93	62	16.53	72.73	.36
The principal and student teacher **	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9	1	0.16	1	0.26	-	-
Student teacher and head of school's English department**	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.9	1	0.16	1	0.26	-	-
Others*	3	1.6	2	0.9	1	1.0	1	0.9	7	1.12	5	1.33	-	-
N(multiple responses)=	187		231		98		107		623		375		82.08=	
Total %		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		99.98		99.96		

*Others include the school principal instead of the cooperating teacher; the student teacher but not the cooperating teacher; all involved persons when appropriate; those requested by the cooperating teacher; the director of teacher education and the principal; and English faculty member.

Attitudes Toward Supervision

Many observers have deplored the all-too-common low status of the role of the college supervisor of English student teaching. Traditionally, the English department is thought to assume that the English supervisor has sold out to the educationists; the education department considers him to be a person who is essentially filling in at this task because nothing better is currently available; the cooperating teacher feels that the supervisor visits to evaluate him more than to evaluate the student teacher; the principal feels that the supervisor brings a "theoretical" rather than "practical" approach to teaching; and the student teacher feels the supervisor is an ogre whose pedagogical whims are to be placated.

In contrast, perhaps the respondents who filled out the questionnaire were overly positive about attitudes toward supervision, or perhaps the occasional highly negative expressions one hears have induced gross and erroneous misjudgments. Whatever the reason, the respondents consider that the role and function of the English supervisor is a valuable one in the eyes of each of the seven composite groups asked about--the college education department, the college English department, the college administration, the secondary school administration, the cooperating teacher, the student teacher, and the supervisor himself.

The tables below which list the general attitudes of these groups toward the supervisor's role are, admittedly, arrived at rather arbitrarily. The questionnaire asked the respondent to write the general attitude of each group toward the role, functions, and professional status of the college supervisor of English student teachers. These open-ended answers were then interpreted and codified into seven classifications--neutral (indifferent); three positive categories (satisfactory, good, excellent) and three negative categories (tolerated, poor, antagonistic). The tables indicate the number of responses placed into each of the categories.

In adding the percentages of responses translated into the excellent and good categories, one finds that the attitude of student teachers toward the supervisor is highest of the seven groups. According to 83.1 percent of the respondents, (1) student teachers hold an excellent or good attitude toward the supervisor. Following closely behind are the (2) supervisors themselves with 82.5 percent in the combined excellent and good categories. Percentages of the other groups with attitudes rated as excellent and good are these:

3) on the part of the cooperating teacher, 76.6%;
4) on the part of the secondary school administration, 76.3%;
5) on the part of the college education department, 71.6%;
6) on the part of the college administration, 57.3%;
7) on the part of the college English department, 54.3%.

For many readers of this report, comments may be more meaningful than the tabulation in the tables. Among the typical responses are these:

1) On the part of the student-teacher:

> ...regards the supervisor not only as a critic, but as a source of guidance, suggestions and consultation.

Stress is placed on an informal, friendly relationship, with the supervisor as a critic-teacher-friend.

...regards the supervisor as a person employed to help him become a competent teacher. (We work hard at this.)

For the most part, they learn to appreciate suggestions, constructive criticism, and usually rate our methods and student teaching courses as their most significant college experiences.

I'm sure we're seen by many as 'incurable idealists'.

...wishes he were more available, has more respect for his wisdom and experience than he merits.

...usually very fine. Sometimes they have been prejudiced by members of the English department before they do student teaching.

...thinks the supervisor is important and draws on him for various kinds of help. There is some reserve on part of some students because of the supervisor's grade-giving function.

...fears the supervisor's criticism. It's better to let the student teacher analyze himself.

...feels that the college supervisor should be free to give more help than he does.

...feels that the supervisor actually knows less than the cooperating teacher.

2) On the part of the supervisor:

...a catalyst in bringing the necessary elements to function successfully.

...a job worth doing and very rewarding--no feeling of inferiority.

I think that imaginative supervision is a necessary help to the student teacher to assist him in implementing his knowledge of the field in the classroom.

Hopeful, intent upon making a helpful analysis of the situation and providing helpful specific suggestions.

Many of us 'take' 2 or 3 student teachers as extra load to keep in touch. I think attitude is very good.

...takes it seriously; sometimes feels inadequate to offer much help.

Regards himself as an important member of a team.

On pay day he wonders, but usually he is convinced of its importance and challenge.

Favorable and supportive, but critical of selection procedures for cooperating teachers.

It is a very fine position providing a great deal of satisfaction to a person who has taught English in the high school. Without that background, I feel that the work might be meaningless.

I believe the responsibility is somewhat too vast to be discharged by mere human beings.

A super person is needed to play so many roles. Who is equal to the task?

There's evidence that student teaching coordination lacks long-range career attractiveness. Ambitious men reaching academic maturity want out of it.

Professional status is less than satisfactory.

I see myself as of little use in actually helping the students I observe. The travel time, the visiting with administrators, etc., are all lost hours. The cooperating teacher actually supervises.

3) On the part of the cooperating teacher:

There is a close professional relationship with cooperating teachers nurtured by frequent conferences and joint decisions relating to the welfare of the student teacher.

...regards the supervisor as a colleague who is a valuable resource person.

...welcomes a co-worker. The exchange of ideas, methods, etc. is beneficial to both teachers.

...feels the supervisor should have a strong background in studying and in teaching English. He should interpret and coordinate the program in student teaching in English.

...friendly and cooperative, but insecure at first.

...doesn't always understand our role, sometimes resents, but most of the time very cooperative.

It varies, many are threatened. Some enjoy having us. We try to help and to establish long-range rapport.

...favorable and mixed, depending on the supervisor's espousal of prescriptive or descriptive linguistics.

...varies from 'What's he here for?' to 'Help!'

Varies from 'Stay away completely; you're intruding' to 'You do it; I don't know what to do'.

4) On the part of the secondary school administration:

...very important. The supervisor helps student teachers give the high school students the best possible education and perhaps improves the teaching of cooperating teachers.

...generally excellent--a good source of consultative service.

Very interested in the program and advice from the supervisor because the administrators often choose the best of the student teachers for jobs.

Secondary school principals look upon supervision as a cooperative endeavor and upon the supervisor as a necessary adjunct.

...varies greatly from district to district. Some schools recognize responsibility for training of teachers; others feel our program an imposition.

...sees him as representing the student-teaching program at the college.

They like having us in the schools, using us when possible. They don't like us to stir anything up.

Some see a professor in their schools as a threat, while others see him as an unpaid consultant.

...would just as soon not be bothered.

5) On the part of the college education department:

...a critical role; the one who guides the student teacher to the wedding of theory and practice. He has full professional status.

...gives on-the-job assistance to both student teacher and cooperating teacher in improving former's readiness as a teacher. In status, it is among the most important positions on our staff.

...entrusts to the college supervisor of English the task of providing prospective teachers with knowledge of the content to be covered, techniques and procedures to be employed, and the teaching aids and materials to be studied.

...thinks it an onerous but very important task.

While considered a key person in the functioning of the student teaching program, the supervisor is generally not of high academic rank.

...recognizes importance of the position, but most senior professors do not desire this job.

...generally good, but probably slightly less than teachers of graduate courses in terms of prestige.

The job is recognized as important, but financial commitment to supporting supervisors is not commensurate with the feeling.

...not involved. The education department is concerned with elementary education only.

...expresses animosity toward the English department for usurping their traditional role.

...does not understand that we [respondent is an English supervisor] are specialists and have much to offer regarding the teaching of English. Regards us as general supervisors.

The promotion committee couldn't care less. Promotions are based on writing books and doing research.

6) On the part of the college administration:

...regards student teaching as one of the important functions of the college of education and the supervisor as a vital part of the program.

Good support from the college president. The academic dean encourages supervisor's attendance at NCTE, CEE, and regional meetings.

...has a generally good attitude. Salary and promotion policies are the same as for other instructors of permanent ranks.

...an agent of the college in a position of public relations in interpreting the teacher training program.

More interested in figures--enrollment and money--than in the students or supervisors. But they do cooperate at times.

...accept, but not inclined to grant status, i.e., academic rank, promotion, etc.

The attitude of the college administration is one of passive acceptance of the role but no conviction of the imperative need for a supervisor.

'What do you do out there?'

...a necessary evil (and a costly one)...Important, however, because 60 percent of our students become teachers.

...thinks he is expensive.

7) On the part of the college English department:

The English department feels that an English teacher should supervise its majors who are teaching and releases the teacher from six hours of teaching load to supervise.

...positive approach toward assisting with the supervision of student teachers and feels that the college supervisor has a key role in assisting them in the preparation of English teachers.

The head of the English department regards the work very highly. He especially wants the position filled by someone whose qualifications include recent teaching experience in the secondary school English classroom.

He should be a member of the English department who can train students in teaching as well as in subject matter. The status should be that of other members of the English department.

...a colleague who adds to the probable success of their majors.

Much improvement here!...The English and education departments are cooperating well in their programs now.

...regards them as 'ed' staff members...relations quite friendly, however.

The job is considered important; but rarely does a member of that faculty wish or have the time to do any.

...has no particular idea about what is being done and indicates no particular concern.

...has some doubts about the supervisor's competency in this role.

...insists that the supervisor of English student teaching be a member of the English department and officed there, but pays no attention to and seems to care nothing about the supervising itself.

γ

> Few, if any, of the professors would engage in this activity.
>
> Unfortunately, there is little, if any, articulation between the supervisor and the English department.
>
> ...looks down on us, couldn't care less. Regards our work as being of little significance.

TABLE 40: GENERAL ATTITUDE OF STUDENT TEACHERS TOWARD ROLE, FUNCTION, STATUS OF COLLEGE SUPERVISOR OF ENGLISH STUDENT TEACHERS

	Responses and Percentages of Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%		
Excellent	21	20.7	37	32.1	6	12.2	18	36.7	82	26.11
Good	68	67.3	49	42.6	35	71.4	27	55.1	179	57.00
Satisfactory	7	6.9	13	11.3	3	6.1	0	0.0	23	7.32
Indifferent	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.32
Tolerated	1	0.9	2	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.94
Poor	3	2.9	0	0.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	4	1.26
Antagonistic	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00
Varies	0	0.0	10	8.6	4	8.1	4	8.1	18	5.73
Unknown, uncertain	1	0.9	3	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	1.26
N =	101		115		49		49		314	
Total %		99.6		99.7		99.8		99.9		99.94
No response	48		53		23		27		151	

TABLE 41: GENERAL ATTITUDE OF COLLEGE SUPERVISOR OF ENGLISH STUDENT TEACHERS TOWARD HIS ROLE, FUNCTIONS, STATUS

	Responses and Percentages of Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%		
Excellent	28	27.7	58	52.7	30	63.8	29	51.7	145	46.17
Good	54	53.4	39	35.4	12	25.5	9	16.0	114	36.30
Satisfactory	11	10.8	11	10.0	2	4.2	10	17.8	34	10.82
Indifferent	1	0.9	1	0.9	0	0.0	3	5.3	5	1.59
Tolerated	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.7	2	0.64
Poor	2	1.9	1	0.9	2	4.2	1	1.7	6	1.91
Antagonistic	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.3	3	0.96
Varies	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	2	0.64
Unknown, uncertain	3	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.96
N =	101		110		47		56		314	
Total %		98.5		99.9		99.8		99.5		99.99
No response	48		58		25		20		151	

TABLE 42: GENERAL ATTITUDE OF COOPERATING TEACHERS TOWARD ROLE, FUNCTION, STATUS OF COLLEGE SUPERVISOR OF ENGLISH STUDENT TEACHERS

	Responses and Percentages of Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%		
Excellent	14	13.5	41	36.2	8	16.3	22	36.6	85	26.15
Good	69	66.9	47	41.5	29	59.1	19	31.6	164	50.46
Satisfactory	11	10.6	10	8.8	6	12.2	6	10.0	33	10.15
Indifferent	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00
Tolerated	0	0.0	2	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.62
Poor	2	1.9	0	0.0	1	2.0	1	1.6	4	1.23
Antagonistic	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.6	1	0.31
Varies	7	6.7	13	11.5	5	10.2	11	18.3	36	11.07
N =	103		113		49		60		325	
Total %		99.6		99.7		99.8		99.7		99.99
No response	46		55		23		16		140	

TABLE 43: GENERAL ATTITUDE OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIONS TOWARD ROLE, FUNCTION, STATUS OF COLLEGE SUPERVISOR OF ENGLISH STUDENT TEACHERS

	Responses and Percentages of Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%		
Excellent	20	19.8	34	30.6	27	54.0	18	33.3	99	31.32
Good	66	65.3	44	39.6	11	22.0	21	38.8	142	44.93
Satisfactory	10	9.9	24	21.6	7	14.0	8	14.8	49	15.50
Indifferent	1	0.9	2	1.8	0	0.0	2	3.7	5	1.58
Tolerated	1	0.9	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.63
Poor	2	1.8	5	4.5	1	2.0	0	0.0	8	2.53
Antagonistic	0	0.0	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.32
Varies	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	8.0	5	9.2	9	2.84
Unknown, uncertain	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.32
N =	101		111		50		54		316	
Total %		99.5		99.9		100.0		99.8		99.97
No response	48		57		22		22		149	

TABLE 44: GENERAL ATTITUDE OF EDUCATION DEPARTMENT TOWARD ROLE, FUNCTIONS, STATUS OF COLLEGE SUPERVISOR OF ENGLISH STUDENT TEACHERS

	Responses and Percentages of Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%		
Excellent	28	26.6	41	45.5	15	30.6	18	32.7	102	34.11
Good	53	50.4	20	22.2	21	42.8	18	32.7	112	37.45
Satisfactory	15	14.2	19	21.1	12	24.4	10	18.1	56	18.72
Indifferent	3	2.8	4	4.4	0	0.0	1	1.8	8	2.67
Tolerated	1	0.9	1	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.67
Poor	2	1.9	3	3.3	0	0.0	8	14.5	13	4.34
Antagonistic	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	2.0	0	0.0	2	0.67
Varies	0	0.0	1	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.33
Unknown, uncertain	3	2.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.00
N =	105		90		49		55		299	
Total %		99.6		99.8		99.8		99.8		99.96
No response	44		78		23		21		166	

TABLE 45: GENERAL ATTITUDE OF COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION TOWARD ROLE, FUNCTIONS, STATUS OF COLLEGE SUPERVISOR OF ENGLISH STUDENT TEACHERS

	Responses and Percentages of Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%		
Excellent	12	11.2	24	22.2	11	20.7	18	30.0	65	19.81
Good	54	50.4	33	30.5	23	43.3	13	21.6	123	37.50
Satisfactory	17	15.8	30	27.7	7	13.2	6	10.0	60	18.29
Indifferent	13	12.1	16	14.8	5	9.4	14	23.3	48	14.63
Tolerated	4	3.7	1	0.9	0	0.0	3	5.0	8	2.43
Poor	2	1.8	1	0.9	4	7.5	1	1.6	8	2.43
Antagonistic	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00
Varies	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.6	1	0.30
Unknown, uncertain	5	4.6	3	2.7	3	5.6	4	6.6	15	4.57
N =	107		108		53		60		328	
Total %		99.6		99.7		99.7		99.7		99.96
No response	42		60		19		16		137	

TABLE 46: GENERAL ATTITUDE OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENT TOWARD ROLE, FUNCTIONS, STATUS OF COLLEGE SUPERVISOR OF ENGLISH STUDENT TEACHERS

	Responses and Percentages of Categories of Size of English Teacher Preparation Programs									
	1 to 9 Students		10 to 29 Students		30 to 49 Students		50 + Students		Total	%
	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%	Data	%		
Excellent	9	8.4	30	25.8	14	28.0	10	17.2	63	19.03
Good	48	44.8	42	36.2	15	30.0	12	20.6	117	35.34
Satisfactory	20	18.6	18	15.5	6	12.0	10	17.2	54	16.31
Indifferent	12	11.2	14	12.0	8	16.0	15	25.8	49	14.80
Tolerated	6	5.6	4	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	3.02
Poor	9	8.4	7	6.0	6	12.0	2	3.4	24	7.25
Antagonistic	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	4	6.8	5	1.51
Varies	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.7	2	0.60
Unknown, uncertain	2	1.8	0	0.0	1	2.0	4	6.8	7	2.11
N =	107		116		50		58		331	
Total %		99.7		99.7		100.0		99.5		99.97
No response	42		52		22		18		134	

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions derived from this study apply only to the population upon which this investigation was conducted--465 colleges and universities in the United States that prepare secondary school English teachers. It is felt that the 465 schools are representative and that similar data from the non-responding 350-plus colleges and universities that prepare English teachers would not differ greatly. This generalization could be verified by a similar, subsequent investigation.

Although most institutions are moderately pleased with their English teacher preparation programs and products, many respondents indicated areas of dissatisfaction with current practices.

Although good relations between English and education departments are notoriously poor in reputation, the two groups seem to be reasonably amiable and cooperative in practice. A majority of the respondents indicated at least a satisfactory relationship between the two departments in their schools.

In a majority of institutions, the attitudes of individuals and groups toward the role of the supervisor is a positive one.

The typical English student teacher receives six semester hours or twelve quarter hours of credit for half a semester or an entire quarter during his senior year. He usually teaches in a public senior high school about 30 miles away from the college, getting in about 90 hours of actual teaching.

The cooperating teacher is directly responsible for inducting the student teacher into the secondary school classroom activity. The cooperating teacher is selected by the director of student teaching at the college, with assistance from the English supervisor and upon the recommendation of the secondary school principal. The cooperating teacher is paid a small honorarium, usually $50, and is given a few additional fringe benefits and some items of preparation by the college.

The college supervisor may come from professorial or from graduate assistant ranks with a departmental affiliation in either English or education (sometimes both). He usually has had experience as a teacher of high school English, has given evidence of being an able teacher himself, and sometimes teaches the English special methods course, if one is available in the college. He usually has too many student teachers to supervise and is able to visit and observe each only three or four times.

Among the areas in which supervision practices and ideals differ significantly are these:

1) student teaching in the senior year or graduate program
2) listing of student teaching as an education course or as a joint offering with the English department
3) the number of hours of actual teaching by each student teacher
4) half-day or full-day teaching
5) kinds of evaluation devices--letter grades and written forms
6) persons responsible for selection of English cooperating teachers

7) basic qualifications of cooperating teachers
8) kinds of training given by colleges to cooperating teachers
9) number of student teachers assigned to each supervisor
10) distances the supervisor must travel to visit secondary schools
11) number of visits, hours observing, consultations of supervisor with student teacher

RECOMMENDATIONS

For Improvements in Programs

Two types of recommendations based upon comparison of current practices and suggested ideal arrangements are included in this section: those inferred from tests of statistical significance (chi-square at the .001 level of significant difference, and index numbers above 1.50 and below 0.50) and those not necessarily statistically significant but which seem to have some importance in improving English teacher preparation programs.

The following recommendations are made on the basis of statistically significant data:

> Student teaching should be listed as a joint offering in English and education departments rather than the usual practice--an education course.
>
> Student teaching should be moved into the graduate program as much as possible.
>
> Student teaching should be done on a full-day basis for the entire semester or quarter. In this way, each student would have little difficulty in reaching 180 or more clock hours of actual classroom teaching.
>
> Each candidate in the English teacher preparation program should receive a tentative student teaching placement and meet his probable cooperating teacher during the students' sophomore or junior years.
>
> Secondary English teacher preparation programs should emphasize courses in special English teaching methods. English education specialists should teach the course.
>
> The traditional A-B-C system of evaluating student teaching should be replaced with a different system of reporting the evaluation. The evaluation should emphasize comprehensive written reports and checklists on the part of the supervisor and the cooperating teacher.
>
> The college supervisor, working with the college director of student teaching, should have major responsibility in selecting the cooperating English teachers in the secondary schools. Less responsibility should be placed in the hands of the secondary school principal.
>
> In choosing a cooperating teacher, more emphasis should be placed upon the person's having done graduate work in English, his holding a master's degree, and his having had a course in supervision. Less emphasis perhaps should be placed upon the principal's recommendation as a basic qualification.

The teaching load of the cooperating teacher should be reduced in order that he may have more time to work with student teachers. In order for this arrangement to be feasible, a new concept needs to be introduced: the secondary school English teacher directly responsible for the work of three or four student teachers. These student teachers would teach in the cooperating teacher's classes in addition to an occasional class with another English teacher. The work of this "released time" cooperating teacher would actually be as much that of supervisor as cooperating teacher. Such an arrangement would need to be worked out cooperatively by the school system and the college.

Cooperating teachers, at least those of the type described in the preceding recommendation, should be given an academic title in the college faculty and listing in the faculty roster.

Although working arrangements between school systems and colleges vary considerably, an honorarium of at least $100 should be paid the cooperating teacher for each student teacher with whom he works.

The college should provide a workshop, under the direction of the English supervisor(s), for the secondary English teachers who have been assigned to serve as cooperating teachers in its program.

The number of student teachers assigned to each college supervisor should be reduced appreciably, the ideal number being four or five as the equivalent of a one-third teaching load. In this way, the supervisor can make as many as seven visits to each student teacher's school, seeing him actually teach ten or more classes. Each visit to the school should include consultation with both the student teacher and the cooperating teacher. The principal of the secondary school should be invited occasionally to confer with the supervisor and the cooperating teacher.

Unless supervisors can work in resident centers or spend entire days at one secondary school, they should not be required to visit schools more than 20 miles away. For supervisors who can spend only part of the day at the secondary school, travel time cuts too much into the best part of the working day if the distance is any further.

The supervisor of English student teachers should have specific affiliation with the English methods course, either as teacher or assistant. He should also assist in the general methods course.

The following recommendations are based on observations:

For consistency in the field, English education specialists should decide upon the terms "student teacher" and "cooperating teacher" to refer to these individuals. Perhaps the term "intern" should be used exclusively in graduate programs involving part-time paid teaching.

Colleges should initiate individual counseling of English teacher preparation candidates both before their admission to the program and throughout the preparation period.

State departments of education should investigate the possibility of providing an additional kind of certification for secondary school cooperating teachers. Before certification, certain requirements would have to have been met: master's degree, prescribed number of years of teaching experience, prescribed number of hours of credit in the teaching area, courses and/or workshops in supervision.

Teacher preparation institutions should choose supervisors of student teachers from those persons who have had experience in teaching secondary school English and who have maintained an interest in the field of English education. Whether his college departmental affiliation is education or English is unimportant.

The supervisor should receive a minimum of one hour teaching load credit for every student teacher with whom he works. In this way, he would be able to provide the amount of time specified in recommendations stated earlier.

Representatives of both the English and education departments should visit each English student teacher, although one of them would be designated as the head supervisor.

If articulation problems exist between groups within the college community, the English education specialist should make a definite attempt to improve understanding between these individuals and departments.

To assure themselves of success in an English teacher preparation program, colleges and universities should pay particular attention to the quality of supervisors of student teachers, the quality of the English methods courses, the careful screening of candidates to the English teacher preparation programs, and the careful placement of candidates in student teaching situations.

Suggestions for Future Research

On the basis of unanswered questions brought to mind in the conducting of this survey, the investigator would make the following recommendations for future research:

1. an in-depth study of a few of the institutions included in this report, institutions which--according to the completed questionnaire--seem to have an especially successful program in the supervision of English student teaching

2. a survey of the attitudes of secondary school cooperating teachers toward college supervisors, the working arrangements between cooperating teachers and supervisors

3. an attempt to determine the ideal placement of student teachers--the matching of the student teacher with the most nearly appropriate teacher, secondary school, community

4. a study of the factors of success of a student teacher's experience

5. a survey of English teachers during their first year of teaching to determine the strengths and weaknesses of their student teaching experiences

6. the development of a meaningful rating scale for use specifically in the observation of student teaching in secondary school English

SUMMARY

The present study was an attempt to survey the current practices related to the supervision of student teachers of English in secondary schools, to ask about ideal supervisory practices, to tabulate both sets of data, and to discover areas of significant difference between practice and ideal.

A review of literature in education reveals some research projects related to student teaching and its supervision. The Association for Student Teaching, of course, has instigated and carried on much of the available study on the topic. Very little research has been done, however, in the specific area of student teaching and its supervision as related to secondary school English. This study has attempted to provide data on the topic.

Questionnaires were sent to 837 American colleges and universities that prepare students for teaching English in secondary schools. Usable completed or partially completed questionnaires were received from respondents in 465 institutions.

Although the survey was especially concerned with supervision practices, the survey instrument also provided data concerning the entire student teaching program in the 465 colleges and universities.

Current practices were tabulated concerning four aspects of the English student teaching programs: arrangements and facilities for student teaching, selection and work of cooperating teachers, responsibilities of the college supervisors, and attitudes of college and secondary school personnel toward the supervision program. In connection with several of the current practices, an "ideal" practice was also asked for. Statistical analyses--through chi-square and index number tests--were made of the differences between practice and ideal in order to determine which practices are in the ascendancy, which in the descendancy.

QL-43